

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. 408.—JULY, 1906.

Art. I.—ENGLAND IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.

1. *England in the Mediterranean (1603–1715)*. By Julian S. Corbett. Two vols. London: Longmans, 1904.
 2. *The Administration of the Royal Navy (1509–1660)*. By M. Oppenheim. London: John Lane, 1896.
 3. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Naval Manuscripts in the Pepysian Library, Cambridge*. Edited for the Navy Records Society by J. R. Tanner. Two vols. 1903–4.
 4. *Historical Manuscripts Commission*. Fourteenth Report, Appendix, Part VI. Manuscripts of the House of Lords, 1692–1693. London: Spottiswoode, 1894.
 5. *House of Lords' Manuscripts*. New Series. Vol. I, 1693–1695; vol. II, 1695–1697. London: Spottiswoode, 1900–3.
- And other works.

AMONG the contests for the mastery of the seas waged in times past by English seamen, the battles with the Dutch are distinguished by the peculiar stubbornness and tenacity displayed by both combatants. Camperdown was certainly not the least evenly or fiercely contested of the great sea-fights of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars; and the very names of 'the Three Days' Battle' of February 1653 and of 'the Four Days' Battle' of June 1666 are themselves some indication of the determination, the endurance, and the desperate valour which have made so memorable those hard-fought struggles. So keen was the rivalry inspired by the memories of Amboyna and by commercial jealousies no less potent than the religious passions which had embittered the struggle with Spain, so stubborn and equal was the contest, so large the space which those furious encounters in the Channel and

the North Sea fill on the canvas on which we picture the navy of the seventeenth century, that one may fairly call the Dutch wars the most important feature in the naval history of the period. It is therefore with something akin to surprise that we find Mr Corbett bidding us set the Dutch wars aside as 'but an episode,' and calling upon us to look elsewhere for the line of naval development which he would have us regard as the greatest, the most central, the most abiding, of the whole century.*

Nor is our natural surprise at this apparent paradox by any means diminished when we find that the event, which is given precedence as the principal naval feature of the seventeenth century, namely, the establishment of England's naval power in the Mediterranean, is one usually associated with the eighteenth. Indeed, the Peace of Utrecht, with which Mr Corbett's volumes close, is to most people the beginning of England's career as a Mediterranean power. But Mr Corbett has accustomed us to find in his works bold and novel views cogently upheld; and the case which is presented in the brilliant and fascinating pages of 'England in the Mediterranean' is one which cannot but carry conviction, even if, in endeavouring to bring out the great importance of this hitherto unappreciated aspect of our naval history, Mr Corbett is at times a little too emphatic and fixes his attention too unreservedly on the Mediterranean. For example, his estimate of the influence of the Portuguese offer in bringing about the Restoration † is a little difficult to accept; and one might quote more than one case in which he seems to attribute more importance to the action, or even to the inaction, of British sea-power within 'the Straits' than the facts quite warrant. Still, the standpoint from which he views the period is so new and original that we need not wonder if he should occasionally 'arouse a suspicion of mirage'; and one may take exception to particular points without feeling any the less grateful for the new light which he has thrown on the period, for his brilliant and suggestive handling of a theme so full of interest and importance.

Perhaps the best example of his work is his treatment of the story of the English occupation of Tangier. That

* 'England in the Mediterranean,' vol. i, p. vi.

† *Ib.* ii, 4-6.

episode is usually neglected by historians as of little real importance. Possibly, at most, a passing reference is vouchsafed to the notorious Colonel Percy Kirke and his no less famous 'Lambs';* or the expenses incurred by the occupation or the evacuation may be quoted as proof of the worthlessness of the post. But Mr Corbett does full justice to the importance of Tangier and to the tragedy of its fate, for it is nothing less than tragic. It is now seen that the occupation was no mere side issue, devoid of importance or of other than local interest, but that it was the fruit of a deliberate policy, an attempt to plant England's power firmly at one of the great strategical centres of the world.

Equally unfamiliar to the majority of Mr Corbett's readers will be his sketch of the circumstances which first caused England's intervention in the Mediterranean. Even those who may recollect encountering the 'Sallee rovers' in the pages of 'Robinson Crusoe' would probably find some difficulty in giving any account of those famous scourges of the sea; and Mr Corbett has done good service in rescuing from oblivion the British renegade Ward, who first taught the Barbary corsairs how to make use of sailing-ships in their struggles with Spain for the control of the Mediterranean trade-routes. It was in this way that the broadside sailing-ship, the new weapon of sea-power which the ocean-going navies of the North had developed, came to enter the Mediterranean, and to encounter and defeat the galley in the classic home of the oared war-vessel. So, too, it was for the ostensible purpose of operating 'against the corsairs' that the ships of the Stewart navy first passed through the Straits.

Mansell's expedition against the Algerian pirates (1620), described by Mr Corbett, has an importance

* Mr Corbett is not quite accurate about the relations of Kirke to the two distinguished regiments which at the present day represent the infantry of the Tangier garrison (II, 120). The regiment which Kirke raised in 1680 and took out to Tangier as the 'Second Tangier Regiment,' was not the 'Lambs.' That hardly enviable notoriety was earned by the 'Old' Tangier Regiment, one of those formed in 1661 out of the Dunkirk garrison. Kirke was transferred to this regiment in 1684, and was in command of it when, on the return of the garrison to England, it took rank on the English establishment as second among the infantry of the line, as the 2nd Foot, or Queen's; Kirke's original corps, the Second Tangier, became the 4th Foot, the present King's Own (Royal Lancaster) Regiment.

far beyond the meagre results it achieved. It was a foretaste of greater things; and it is a pardonable exaggeration when Mr Corbett hails it as 'one of the most momentous departures in history . . . redeeming a contemptible reign from much of its insignificance'; for the expedition is pre-eminently one of the cases of which Mr Corbett is so fond, when 'what did not happen is at least as important as what did.' Once in the Mediterranean, a British squadron might play many parts: it might find itself off Genoa or Brindisi quite as easily as off Tunis or Algiers. Indeed, as Mr Corbett says, an expedition against the Barbary corsairs was 'the stock diplomatic formula for covering some sinister and ulterior design.' Mansell might have been used on behalf of the Palatine house; and his presence in the Mediterranean must have given Spanish statesmen some anxious moments. But, though James did not manage to make the weight of the English Navy felt on the Neckar and on the Danube, Mansell's expedition deserves to be remembered as one of the first steps in the process by which England found her way to the Mediterranean, 'that sea about which for centuries the destinies of the civilised world had seemed to turn,' and came to fix her grasp on 'the old focal points of European polity.' Bad as is the administrative record of the reigns of James I and Charles I, this much must be set down to their credit: they appreciated the potentialities of the navy, and sought to use it. James I may at least claim to have 'inaugurated a new field for the action of the English Navy. Feebly as the new policy had been started, a precedent had been set.'

But it was not by James himself or by his unhappy son that the new departure was to be resumed with greater success. It was not till the Commonwealth, having established its power in the British Isles, sought to obtain admission, as a recognised member, into the European state-system, that British warships were again to pass between the Pillars of Hercules. Almost the first task which lay before the new Government which had replaced the overthrown monarchy, was to win recognition from its reluctant and unfriendly neighbours. But for the navy this would have been difficult. At first the other nations of Europe showed a disposition to regard the regicide state

as outside the pale of ordinary international relations, to treat British merchant ships as fair game, and to deny to British envoys the sanctity of ambassadors. But, fortunately for the Commonwealth, it possessed in the navy an argument to which Europe had to listen. Charles I had failed to enforce honesty or efficiency in naval administration; his expenditure on the navy had hardly been laid out to the best advantage; but he had not allowed its strength to fall off, and his successors were indebted to him for the force which they put to better use. It was not long before the Continent discovered that the inefficiency which had made the expeditions to Cadiz and Rochelle such shameful pages in our naval history had passed away with those responsible for it.* A little experience of the length of the British arm and of the ubiquity of the British Navy soon caused France and Spain to alter their tone. And the main theatre of the exploits by which the navy enforced respect for the British flag and won recognition for the Commonwealth was the Mediterranean, with the portions of the Atlantic immediately outside the Straits.

Mr Corbett's account of this process is both lucid and dramatic. About half the first volume of 'England in the Mediterranean' is devoted to its principal incidents—Blake's determined pursuit of Rupert and his tenacious blockade of Lisbon, the work done by Penn and the first true Mediterranean squadron, the check given to British prestige within the Straits by the untoward incidents of the first Dutch war in that quarter, the steps taken by Cromwell to make good that loss of prestige by the despatch of Blake's fleet, and what that fleet and the squadrons which relieved it actually accomplished. Possibly the events within the Mediterranean appear to assume unmerited importance owing to the neglect of what was happening in the North Sea and the Atlantic; for it is only a distant echo of Tromp's guns

* Mr Oppenheim has a most instructive chapter on the Commonwealth period in his 'Administration of the Royal Navy,' in which he pays a high tribute to the zeal and efficiency of the Admiralty Committee and Navy Commissioners on whom the administrative work fell. 'Never, before or since,' he says, 'were the combatant branches of the Navy so well supported. As a rule our seamen have had to beat the enemy afloat in spite of the Admiralty ashore, but here they had every assistance that foresight and earnestness could give' (p. 306).

off Dover that reaches us, and Blake's 'crowning mercy' at Teneriffe is but barely mentioned. But Mr Corbett has little difficulty in showing that the presence of British warships in the Mediterranean exercised an indirect influence which far outweighed their actual achievements. For, just as Mansell's mission to chastise the corsairs had been the cloak to cover greater designs, so Blake, when showing the flag off Leghorn or Civita Vecchia, or destroying Tunisian pirates at Porto Farina, was giving European statesmen a series of object-lessons which Mazarin, for one, did not fail to appreciate.

The Mediterranean fleet was 'a lever to force France into peace and a spell to lull Spain into security'; and in following its actions we obtain a clue to those 'shifting intricacies' and 'bewildering changes of front' which constitute the foreign policy of Cromwell. When Blake sailed to the Mediterranean, no one, certainly not the Protector himself, knew which of the combatants in the long-drawn-out struggle between France and Spain would obtain ultimate victory by the aid of the British fleet. On the whole it was towards Spain that the balance seemed to incline. Less closely connected with the Stewarts, Spain had committed but few outrages on English merchantmen, and had anticipated France in recognising the Commonwealth. Thus Blake's first piece of work was the parrying of a stroke against the most important of Spain's dependencies, the Two Sicilies. The part which he played in wrecking the Duc de Guise's renewed attempt on Naples has probably been overlooked because he was denied the good fortune of bringing Guise to action; nevertheless, the failure of the French expedition was as certainly Blake's work as if it had been published to all Europe by a victory over Guise and his fleet in the Bay of Naples.

This episode admirably illustrates the 'silent' working of sea-power. Mazarin's schemes received a check which went far to bring him to an understanding with Cromwell, on terms rather more satisfactory to the Protector than to the cardinal. As a matter of fact, the Mediterranean saw but little of Cromwell's war with Spain; its principal naval events took place in the West Indies and on the Atlantic, though a British squadron was maintained up the Straits until the close of the war. Its direct influence

on the course of events was but slight, and Mr Corbett perhaps rather exaggerates the extent to which it indirectly influenced Spain to accept terms so unfavourable as those of the Peace of the Pyrenees; still its presence between Toulon and Tetuan, policing the trade-routes and capturing every Spanish ship that dared show itself, was a forcible hint of what a British squadron permanently stationed in the Mediterranean might accomplish.

To the men of the Elizabethan navy the idea that in peace and war alike a British squadron ought to be permanently maintained in the Mediterranean would never have occurred. That by the middle of the seventeenth century it was well within the range of possibility was due to a twofold change which had been revolutionising the navy and its position in the national economy. The navy was becoming more permanent, a profession with a well-defined system and standards, a regular force akin to the standing armies which the great Powers of Europe were forming, something very different indeed from the maritime militia it had mainly been, even under the Tudors. And, as it thus developed, its relations with the mercantile marine underwent a fundamental change. In Tudor days the merchantman had no more thought of relying on the royal navy for protection at sea than had Chaucer's 'Shipman.' It was only in the Narrow Seas that anything in the nature of police work was expected; even there it was irregularly and incompletely discharged. Not only had the most peaceful of traders to provide his own defence, but, even so late as the days of James I, ocean-going merchantmen were still looked on as an integral part of the fighting forces of the realm.

Now this was all changed. Even in 1588 Wynter had written of 'the simple service' done by the merchantmen;* and the truth cannot be sufficiently emphasised that it was by the royal navy, and not by the merchant ships, that the bulk of the fighting of that year was done. Since then, the misconduct of the merchant captains at Cadiz in 1625 had been the subject of bitter complaints, complaints which Blake had, with good reason, repeated after his defeat off Dungeness in November, 1652.† Indeed there

* Cf. 'The Defeat of the Spanish Armada' (Navy Records Society), II, 13.

† Cf. 'First Dutch War' (Navy Records Society), III, No. 580.

was no longer any place for armed merchantmen in the line side by side with the professional elements which were now predominant in the royal navy. Merchantmen were as ill-fitted to cope with a standing naval force as the trained bands of the English shires were to face the veterans of Louis XIV. And thus the merchant marine, ceasing to be part of the effective fighting strength of the navy, became instead a burden upon it. The change is well described by Mr Corbett (i, 226) as

'no mere change in organisation; it was a revolution in the fundamental conception of naval defence. For the first time the protection of the mercantile marine came to be regarded almost as the chief end for which the regular navy existed.'

In discussing the development of the professional side, Mr Corbett lays great stress on the influence of the army. The famous Self-denying Ordinance of 1645 affected the navy as well as the army; and the introduction of a military element into the former, due to the influence of the New Model, had a great share in bringing about the changes in the character of the navy and in the relations between the permanent element and the merchant marine. Stricter discipline, more system in administration and organisation, a definite classification and rating of ships, a regular code of articles of war, a revised scale of pay—all these came with the introduction into the navy of the professional spirit of the scientific soldiers who had given England the New Model Army.

The legacy which the Commonwealth bequeathed to the restored Stewarts was therefore twofold—the tradition of a vigorous foreign policy, and the organised forces whose existence and efficiency had made it possible for that foreign policy to be vigorous and effective. Charles II's endeavour to bend the bow of the Protectorate is the most creditable and at the same time the most tragic feature in his unhappy reign. To him we owe the beginnings of the army, although our gratitude on this score must be tempered by the recollection that the establishment of a permanent military force was fraught with possible dangers to the liberties of the country, a charge which not even the most jealous guardians of the constitution have ever brought against the augmentation of

our naval strength. That Charles had the fullest appreciation of the powers and possibilities of the navy, that, according to his lights, he did his duty by it, that in many respects he improved and strengthened it, will be readily admitted by all those who study his reign with the help of Mr Corbett and of Mr Tanner's Introduction to the Pepysian Manuscripts.

That Charles, appreciating the navy so highly as he did, should yet have been largely responsible for the decline in efficiency and *moral* which stains the history of the Restoration navy, is little short of pathetic; but the fact makes the case against him blacker than ever. The navy could not escape the general degeneration of the period. The low standard of morality, public and private, was bound to affect it. The King could not himself set the example of disregarding honesty, public spirit, and duty without being followed by his subjects. Mr Tanner has no difficulty in showing that, under the restored Stewarts, the navy was on the whole administered by competent and capable men, that there has been a tendency to paint the period in unduly dark colours, and that, except for the years between 1679 and 1684, it was a time of progress in naval affairs. Nor does he go too far when he claims for Charles II a real love of the navy and a knowledge of its requirements; indeed he shows that, as Lord High Admiral, the King went nearer to doing hard work than he did in any other capacity. Yet this cannot absolve Charles from his share of the responsibility for the darker side of things.

It is Samuel Pepys who comes out best in the light of the new evidence. Pepys did admirable work as Clerk of the Acts till 1673, and as Secretary to the Admiralty (of which post he was the first holder) from 1673 to 1679, and again after 1684; he did even more as the prime mover in the famous Commission which was called into existence in 1686 to make good the deficiencies which had resulted from the negligent administration of the period during which he was out of office. Mr Tanner does not in the least exaggerate when he dedicates his volume 'To the memory of Samuel Pepys, a great public servant.' As he says, 'the worst enemy to the reputation of the official Pepys is the Pepys of the "Diary."' The Commission which reported in 1805 spoke of him as 'a man

of extraordinary knowledge in all that related to the business' of the navy, 'of great talents and the most indefatigable industry'; and Mr Tanner's verdict is that 'no one who reads the Pepysian papers can doubt that Pepys was, in his way, one of the best officials England ever had.' It is to the remaining volumes* of this catalogue that those who have not the advantage of knowing the Pepysian papers at first hand will look for the evidence from which to form their own judgment as to Pepys' merits; but Mr Tanner's readers will feel no surprise at his conclusion that, 'under a King that "did hate the very sight and thoughts of business," Pepys did more than any one else to apply business principles to naval administration.'

Mr Tanner's Introduction is a most valuable and original contribution to the history of the navy. The eight headings under which it is arranged—the higher administration, finance, men, pay, victuals, discipline, ships, and guns—give us some impression of the ground it covers. On all these subjects Mr Tanner has found so rich a mine of information in the Pepysian Manuscripts that to follow him in any detail is quite out of the question; we can only indicate a few points which have special importance as throwing light on the great development in the character of the navy. Of these unquestionably the most important is the recognition, in 1668, of the claims of unemployed officers to pay in time of peace. The reduction of the navy to a peace footing on the close of the second Dutch war had thrown a number of deserving officers of high rank out of employment, whereby they were—in the words of the Order in Council of July 17, 1668—'disabled to support themselves in a condition answerable to their merits and those marks of honour his Majesty hath conferred upon them.' Accordingly pensions were granted to them in proportion to the fixed scale of active-service pay; and this boon, at first confined to flag-officers, was subsequently extended to captains of first- and second-rates, to commanders of squadrons of smaller ships, and to masters. The principle thus admitted, and the system introduced,

* The second volume of this catalogue contains a complete précis of the official correspondence of Pepys in the years 1673 and 1674, which gives a favourable impression of his diligent application to his manifold duties.

mark a great step towards the continuous employment of modern days and the growth of the navy as a professional career.

Mr Corbett draws attention to an interesting experiment which, had it been successful, might have anticipated our system of continuous service by a century and a half. The establishment of the Royal Marines is usually regarded as having been intended to provide the fleet with a properly organised landing force, which should always be available. 'Experience had shown how limited was the potentiality of a fleet that had no such extension of its arm'; and in the Spanish Succession war 'the two achievements which established England in the Mediterranean' were largely due to the presence with the fleet of such a force. But, while the six regiments raised in 1702 were a purely military body, though under the control of the Admiralty, the object with which William, in 1689, raised his two regiments of Marines was very different. It was an attempt to supply the dearth of seamen which was such a hindrance to mobilisation, and also to improve the discipline and efficiency of the crews. Afloat, the men of these regiments were to be trained as seamen and gunners; and it was intended that, as they qualified as foremast hands, they should be transferred to the working crew of the ship. The training they were to receive when ashore was meant to make them available for equipping ships in case of any sudden call. Thus these regiments would have served as a nursery for a force of trained and disciplined seamen; and it is to be regretted that this interesting experiment should have incurred the suspicion of those whose antipathy to a standing army led in 1699 to the ill-advised and excessive reduction of that force. William's Marines disappeared in 1699; and the revived Marines of Anne's reign were intended merely as a landing force.*

A measure of the greatest importance was the passing,

* Another interesting but somewhat abortive measure, on which the House of Lords' MSS. throw light, is the Act of 7 & 8 William III, c. 21, for the registration of seamen (New Series, vol. II, p. xvi, and pp. 341 ff.). This measure was connected with the use of Greenwich Palace as a hospital for seaman. It provided that any seaman who should register himself for the King's service should receive a bounty of 40s. per annum, be received into the hospital when disabled, and have other privileges. To a certain extent, therefore, it adopted the principle of continuous service.

in 1661, of a statute (13 Car. II, c. 9) which incorporated into law the articles of war by which discipline had been enforced under the Commonwealth.* Service crimes of great consequence, not capital offences under the common law, now became legally punishable as such, e.g. insubordination, desertion, giving intelligence or supplies to the enemy, sleeping on watch, or misconduct in the face of the enemy. The statute in question was based on the code passed by the Commons in December 1652; and the fact that it remained in force until 1749, when a new and more stringent code (22 Geo. II, c. 33) replaced it, is some indication of its importance in naval affairs. It must, however, be admitted that neither this statute nor the vigilant endeavours of Pepys to keep up a high standard in matters of discipline produced any very satisfactory results. Throughout the Restoration epoch naval discipline was exceedingly lax; the men were turbulent, insubordinate, even mutinous; the officers sold the King's stores for their own profit, took in and transported merchandise, and neglected their duties.

That the seamen should behave badly was hardly surprising, seeing that their pay was invariably in arrears, and that the abuses of the 'ticket' system proved a constant source of trouble and disorder. But 'the breakdown of discipline affected the higher ranks of the service also'; and, though partly to be attributed to the low standard of public and private duty which the Court set and the country imitated, it must also be ascribed, in part, to the absence of service traditions, of *esprit de corps*, of the professional spirit which the reformers of the day were seeking to instil. One of the most noteworthy of their measures was the establishment of an examination for lieutenants. The professional shortcomings of the lieutenants as a class had provoked strongly-worded complaints. Their ignorance of their duty and their lack of seamanship, though due mainly to the rank being given, through Court intrigue or family influence, to persons of insufficient capacity, sprang in some measure from the want of instructions laying down 'the duty and trust' of a lieutenant.† Consequently, in December 1677, after

* Cf. Oppenheim, p. 352, and 'First Dutch War' (Navy Records Society), vol. III, No. 665.

† For commanders such instructions did exist.

the matter had been fully debated by the King and the Lords of the Admiralty, there was adopted a regular 'establishment,' not only 'for the examining of persons pretending to the office of a sea-lieutenant,' but 'also for ascertaining the duty' of that officer.

On the influence of this measure on the development of the naval service as a profession, it is unnecessary to dilate; but the fact should not be overlooked that the period was 'to a peculiar degree' one of framing and revising of 'establishments' in the navy, in other words, 'of the creation of a system, standards, and traditions.' Thus we find in 1677 'a solemn, universal, and unalterable adjustment of the gunning and manning of the whole fleet.' Elaborate instructions were issued in 1686 'for the execution of the duty required from the guardships and boats in Chatham and Portsmouth harbours'; to prevent waste of stores through their being issued 'at the pleasure and discretion of inferior officers in the yards,' the Navy Board draws up a 'deliberate adjustment of the qualities, quantities, and proportions of each distinct species of stores needful to be supplied to each ship of your Majesty's present Navy'; and as a check, none too successful, it is to be feared, on embezzlement, it is ordered that these stores should be marked with the broad arrow. Individually, some of these measures are of little moment; taken together, they are important indications of the efforts to establish order and efficiency in the navy. Mr Tanner's summing-up is that,

'in spite of all defects and disadvantages, some ground was gained in the navy under both Charles and James, and the ground gained was never lost. The naval organisation of 1688 was more efficient and governed by better traditions than that of the earlier part of Charles II's reign, while it was an infinite improvement on the system of organised abuses that existed under Charles I.'

He might have added that, while in mere numbers the navy did not show any great increase in 1688 when compared with the figures for 1660, in size, in number of guns, and in strength of crews, the ships of 1688 showed a great advance.* Moreover, there are many signs of

* The average tonnage of R.N. ships rose from 400 to 600 tons, despite the development of the 'yacht' class, small vessels lightly armed; the crews averaged 240 per ship, as against 125 in 1660, and the guns carried 4 as against 30.

differentiation of ships according to their tactical use. As 'the line' becomes the established tactical formation, a gap makes its appearance between the vessels which are fit to 'lie in the line' and those which are not.*

To all these indications of progress there is, of course, a darker side. But the shortcomings, serious and undeniable as they were, may, on the whole, be attributed to one and the same external cause—external, at least, to the administration of the navy if not to the question of the merits of Charles and James—the perennial shortness of money. The shortcomings of the victuallers, the ill-discipline and desertion of the seamen, the delays over shipbuilding, the failure to provide adequately for the sick and wounded, may all be traced to the want of funds. That Parliament grudged money to the navy it would be unfair to assert; on the whole it voted grants with no little liberality; and, if it did not place supplies at the King's disposal with so lavish a hand as to enable him to indulge in unlimited naval expansion, that must be attributed to distrust of the King rather than to any failure to appreciate the importance of the navy. Neither under Charles nor under James was there sufficient security that a grant voted for the navy would be expended solely on that object. The fate of Tangier, so graphically told by Mr Corbett, is the best illustration of the conflict between the tendency towards Imperial and naval expansion which Charles inherited from the Protectorate, and that ill-starred attempt to subvert the English constitution which was his heritage as a Stewart.

In acquiring a naval station at the most important strategical point in Europe, namely, the entrance to the Mediterranean, Charles II was improving upon the achievements of Cromwell. The idea of making such an acquisition was not new. From the first tentative steps in England's progress into the Mediterranean it had been contemplated. The untoward events of the first Dutch

* It is impossible here to do more than allude to Mr Corbett's most interesting and suggestive Appendix on the vexed question of 'the origin of the line of battle' (cf. 'England in the Mediterranean,' II, 317-329). Moreover, since this article was in type, the Navy Records Society have published (May 1905) the volume which he has edited on 'The Fighting Instructions, 1530-1816,' the value and interest of which to students of naval tactics it would be difficult to overestimate.

war within the Straits* had emphasised the disadvantages of enforced dependence on neutral harbours. Blake during his first cruise had had the use of the Spanish ports; and after the outbreak of the war with Spain, the harbours of Portugal and France had become available. Still Cromwell had seen that the possession of a port would enormously improve England's position by making her independent of uncertain neutrals and doubtful allies; and, when Blake was sent out to blockade Cadiz and intercept the Plate fleet, his instructions included the seizure of such a port.

Cadiz and Gibraltar were indicated as suitable places. Their selection was hardly surprising after the striking demonstration of the enormous strategical importance of the Straits of Gibraltar given in Blake's previous cruise. It was because his fleet was lying in the defile through which alone the two widely separated divisions of the French marine could join hands that he had foiled Guise's attempt on Naples without firing a shot. Niuchèse with the Brest fleet dared not run the gauntlet of the Straits with such a lion in his path; and, without reinforcements from Brest, Guise did not dare to remain off Naples. The inherent weakness of the naval position of France was laid bare. A fleet at the Straits holds the interior position between Brest and Toulon; and the sustained occupation of Cadiz or Gibraltar would enable England to maintain a squadron permanently at the critical spot. It is indeed highly probable that Rooke's most famous exploit would have been anticipated by nearly half a century but for a change in the Protector's policy. As Mr Corbett says (ii, 2),

'His religious zeal boiled to the surface and disturbed the level flow of his more practical and sagacious line of thought. When he saw a chance of leading a great Protestant war on Rome, his imperial policy lost its clearness; and the result was the occupation of Dunkirk instead of Gibraltar.'

The conclusion of the French alliance was followed by the diversion of the main efforts of the Protector to the Netherlands; and the campaigns which won Dunkirk

* Mr T. A. Spalding's 'Life and Times of Richard Badiley' gives the fullest account of that episode in the war; and Mr Corbett has an admirable chapter on the subject.

absorbed the land forces which might have been more profitably employed in the capture of Gibraltar.

Thus, in transferring to Tangier the garrison of Dunkirk, Charles was bringing England's policy back into the true channel from which Cromwell's aberration had diverted it. Mr Corbett has made abundantly clear the true story of the sale of Dunkirk. It appears as a humiliation to those who see in it the first step in the degrading progress in which the Treaty of Dover is the most shameful stage. But the sale of Dunkirk was the deliberately adopted policy of men like Monk and Sandwich, like Southampton and Clarendon, to whom the Treaty of Dover would have been as abominable as it is to us. They advocated the sale of Dunkirk because without it Tangier could not be occupied. A task for which Cromwell's army had not sufficed, and for which the purse of the Commonwealth had not been long enough, was clearly beyond the resources, military and financial, of Charles II. Both places could not be held; and between the two there could not, either to statesman or to strategist, be any question. To keep Dunkirk would be almost as much of an anachronism as to seek to recover Calais. To occupy Tangier was as much the policy of the future as to possess a bridge-head on the far side of the Channel was that of the past. Moreover, it was most improbable that, even if Tangier were sacrificed for its sake, Dunkirk would long avoid the fate of Calais. Louis XIV meant to have it; and it was better that its inevitable surrender should take the form of a concession than that of a capitulation.

How desirable was the possession of Tangier can best be appreciated from Mr Corbett's spirited narrative of the English occupation. Exposed to the repeated attacks of enemies so crafty, courageous, and determined as the Moorish Sultans Guylan and Muley Ishmael, viewed from the first with bitter jealousy by the Dutch and the Spaniards, it was held with a tenacity and a vigour which makes the almost forgotten story of its defence a very honourable episode in the annals of the British army. But the Moors were not the most formidable enemy by whom Tangier was threatened. The influence of Louis XIV at the Court of Charles II had at first been exercised in support of the proposal to occupy the town; but it

was not long before he perceived that an English 'Straits squadron' based on a permanent naval station might prove an obstacle to his schemes in those quarters; and his failure at Jigelli in 1664 only enhanced his hostility to the successful establishment of England at the entry to the Mediterranean. That Louis had good reason to wish Tangier in other hands was clearly shown by the events of the second Dutch war. So long as Sir Jeremy Smith's squadron lay in the Straits, using Tangier as its base, the French strategists were checkmated. They could not carry out that combination of their Toulon squadron under De Beaufort with the Atlantic fleet under Duquesne which was the necessary preliminary to their intended junction with the Dutch. And De Beaufort could never have made the diversion which was the principal cause of the English defeat in the great Four Days' battle had not the exigencies of the situation in the Narrow Seas necessitated the recall of Smith's squadron. Mr Corbett admits that theoretically this concentration of all the available strength of the navy against the enemy's main force was the soundest move, but he evidently believes that the more risky strategy of leaving Smith to hold the Straits would have been justified by events.

However, Tangier had more uses than this somewhat negative advantage. Merchantmen had found it a haven of refuge from the Dutch even when there was no English squadron to keep the Straits open; and in the third Dutch war the efficacy of the protection afforded by the Straits squadron to British commerce in the Mediterranean was largely due to the advantage of having so convenient a port. Indeed the British possession of Tangier more than balanced the advantage the Dutch gained from the Spanish alliance, which let them use Cadiz as a base for attacking French and English commerce; and, with the chief defect in the English position thus remedied, England's capacity to influence Europe was greatly increased. Not only were the 'normal operations' of the Straits squadron, the protection of our trade against the corsairs, carried on continuously, and therefore with increasing efficiency, but the exploits of Sir Thomas Allin, Sir Edward Spragge, Sir John Narbrough and, last but by no means least, of Sir Arthur Herbert—the Torrington of controversial memory—did

much also to secure English interests and raise England's prestige. Thus, in the closing stages of the war which began with Louis' attack on Holland, the presence of Narbrough's strong squadron in the Straits was undoubtedly one of the things which caused Louis to make peace at Nymwegen. Whatever reasons caused Louis to desert the Sicilian insurgents, the readiness of Narbrough's fleet for action was a strong hint of the unwisdom of conducting oversea operations across waters of which the French navy had not the secure control.

But, if the possession of Tangier and the consequent maintenance of a permanent English squadron in the Mediterranean had proved a factor of so much importance in the affairs of Europe, it is all the more surprising to find Tangier given up just when the completion of the mole was well within sight, and when Fairborne's dying victory seemed to have secured the town against dangers from the land. The story of the intrigues which resulted in its evacuation is not pleasant to read or particularly easy to follow. Even Mr Corbett's lucidity partially deserts him when he seeks to unravel the sordid tangle of complications by which Louis at last secured the object he had sought so long.

Such influence as Louis had over English politics was consistently used against Tangier. In his intrigues with the 'Country Party,' no less than in his dealings with his friends at the Court, he always had this end in view. Certainly it was by a man who owed his readmission to office to French influence that the final proposal for evacuation was introduced. But Sunderland and the partisans of France were not the only enemies Tangier had in England. While the 'Country Party' as a whole were fully aware of its value—as is evident from the resolution of April 9, 1679, that 'those who shall advise his Majesty to part with Tangier to any foreign prince or state . . . ought to be accounted enemies of the King and kingdom'—with the more extreme Protestants of the party Tangier had earned an evil name as a Roman Catholic stronghold. More than one of its governors had been Papists; and there had from the first been a strong Papist element in the garrison; so that many good Protestants looked on any increase in it with suspicion, fearing that the Tangier troops might be used for domestic

objects. Nor were their suspicions without foundation. Just for that object Rochester and Sunderland were anxious to see the Tangier garrison brought home and placed at the disposal of the King and the Duke of York.

Ultimately it was the financial difficulties of the monarchy which made evacuation 'the inevitable end of Charles's autocratic policy.' When Charles requested the Parliament which met in October 1680 to assist him with the funds needed to secure the retention of Tangier, he found that not even for such an object would the Commons trust him with money which they feared might be used to 'augment the strength of their Popish adversaries.' At least they would only vote the supplies on terms which Charles would not grant—'the passing of the Exclusion Bill and the dismissal of every minister who opposed it.' The refusal of Parliament to vote money drove the King to economies; and Tangier was an early victim. Mr Corbett seeks partially to exculpate Charles by throwing the responsibility for the evacuation on the Duke of York and his adherents, Rochester and Sunderland. No doubt they were the authors of the proposal, and it was only with reluctance that Charles consented to the evacuation; but the domestic policy which made the step inevitable was as much his as his brother's. Thus it came about that in the struggle over the Exclusion Bill the doom of Tangier was sealed; to his attempt to subvert the British constitution and the Anglican Church Charles sacrificed the possession which embodied the effort he had made to live up to the Commonwealth traditions of foreign policy.

Had Charles died on the morrow of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, he would cut a very different figure in history. He would appear as one of the princes who have done most for the maritime, colonial, and commercial greatness of England, as a statesman who saw the importance of sea-power and all that makes for it, as one who extended England's rule in Africa and America, in the East and West Indies. The second Dutch war would then lack the sinister tinge which it gathers from being associated with the servile way in which Charles, in 1672, assisted Louis to attack the power with whom he had been allied against France only four years before. Charles had the ill-fortune to outlive his brief day of greatness

by so much that the memory of it has been all but obliterated by his subsequent misdeeds. The abandonment of Tangier is thus no less symbolic than the occupation had been. It marks 'his inability to understand those conditions of sympathy between government and people on which alone a lasting policy of empire can be based.'

Still the work which Charles II and James II had done for the navy was not lost to England. James II, like his father, only made his own defeat more certain by all that he did to strengthen the navy. The government which the Revolution of 1688 established in England owed a great debt to the Commission of 1686, which had left the navy in a thoroughly efficient condition; and the fleet which James saw destroying the French ships that were to have carried him across to England was largely of his own creating. Indeed the success of the League of Augsburg was in no small measure due to the British navy and to William III's brilliant direction of its main efforts towards the Mediterranean, an episode to which Mr Corbett is almost the first historian to do full justice. Even Captain Mahan has failed to bring out the decisive character of William's action in despatching the Main Fleet to the Mediterranean in 1694 and keeping it there through the winter; and though Admiral Colomb, in his 'Naval Warfare,' did rather more to show up the importance of the move, Mr Corbett is really breaking fresh ground in his excellent account of this important but unduly neglected campaign. The effect of his researches is to enhance very materially our opinion of William III as a naval strategist. 'It has been the accepted view that he was a man who could only see war with a soldier's eye'; it is not too much now to claim for him that he grasped the possibilities of the influence of sea-power with a clearness which Marlborough alone among his contemporaries could rival. 'It was not till the fifth year of the war that a radical change in Louis' strategy' led William to realise that 'his ships could be made to give what his battalions could not achieve,' that in the Mediterranean was the heel of the French Achilles. Once, however, he had 'divined the vital secret,' he 'never lifted his eyes from the end.' In the tortuous and abortive negotiations over the Spanish Succession the power of

the British navy to influence Europe through the Mediterranean was the trump-card in William's hands; and the permanent establishment of England in the Mediterranean was the concession he sought to extort from Louis.

Down to the year 1694 the principal task of the British navy had been defensive—to protect England against invasion and to cover the reconquest of Ireland. By 1692 Russell's victory off La Hogue recovered that command of the Narrow Seas which Tourville had so gravely imperilled at Beachy Head;* but not even then was any attempt made 'to strike a real blow at France in the main seat of her power,' the Mediterranean. The fleet was used for operations which Mr Corbett justly calls

'the almost medieval strategy of the wars of Henry VIII . . attacks on the French Channel ports, and raids on the coasts which had no higher object than that of crippling the action of privateers and confusing the strategy of the French armies by diversions';

or it was employed on the new task of commerce protection which the altered relations of the navy and the merchant marine had made one of its principal cares.

Mr Corbett has pointed out (ii, 8) that it was mainly by the influence of France that Charles II was induced to accept the Portuguese offer of Tangier; and so, too, it was the example of Louis XIV that attracted William to the Mediterranean. When the junction of Tourville and the Brest fleet, fresh from its exploit on the Smyrna convoy, with d'Estrées and the Toulon contingent, raised the French force up the Straits to nearly a hundred sail of the line, it was not very likely that the Mediterranean members of the League of Augsburg, if unassisted by their naval allies, would long remain faithful to the alliance. The only means of checking the French invasion of Catalonia and of preventing the wavering Duke of Savoy from coming to terms with France was to imitate Louis XIV by despatching to the Mediterranean the Main Fleet itself. In the original dispositions for the campaign of 1694 there is no indication of this radical

* Russell's letter of May 15th (Lords' MSS., 1692-1693, p. 204) shows that the numerical superiority of the allies at La Hogue has been exaggerated; the English had 57 ships of the line, not 64; the Dutch only 22 instead of (as is usually asserted) 36. Moreover, in the actual fighting the English were outnumbered, as only 40 ships were engaged (ib. p. 211).

change of strategy. The Main Fleet was intended rather to prevent Tourville from taking back to the Mediterranean the Brest and Rochefort squadrons, which had returned to the Atlantic ports during the winter because it was impossible to refit the whole fleet at Toulon. But the orders issued to Russell in April 'disclose the first definite conception of the new strategy'; he is ordered, 'in case the French fleet is at Brest, to attempt to burn or destroy it . . . in case he has trustworthy information that it is gone to the Mediterranean . . . to follow and attack it.' And when, on May 4, William, obtaining trustworthy information that the French had left Brest for the Straits, promptly, and on his own responsibility, sent orders to Russell to lose no time in following them, the admiral was not found wanting. By July 1 he was off the mouth of the Straits with 41 British and 24 Dutch ships of the line under his flag; and a week later a westerly breeze allowed him to carry out the memorable operation for which he deserves to live in the annals of Great Britain. It is not the victory of La Hogue that is his real title to fame; it is that he was the first British admiral to lead the Main Fleet into the Mediterranean.

The success of the movement was immediate. Tourville promptly retired to Toulon; De Noailles' attack on Barcelona, the effort for which Louis had sacrificed operations elsewhere, came to a standstill for want of naval assistance. But Russell's success was only negative. Tourville's retreat to Toulon was a most effective parry to the new strategy; and with it he inaugurated that defensive attitude which caused Collingwood and Nelson, and many another English admiral, to fret away their lives through weary months of anxious vigil before those French ports where lurked the enemy, to whom was to be offered, as Nelson said, 'every opportunity to put to sea.' Without a powerful landing force, Russell was impotent against Toulon; and Tourville could lie there snugly and happily till 'the waning of summer should force Russell to begin his homeward voyage,' confident that, in order to get his unhandy 'great ships' safely across the stormy Bay of Biscay before the autumn gales, Russell would have to quit the Mediterranean so early that the French would have ample time to resume and complete the Catalonian campaign.

Then it was that William took the momentous step which more than answered Tourville's cautious retreat to Toulon. He took it on his own initiative and his own responsibility, for the Council, before whom he laid the proposal, refused to give a definite answer, and, while on the whole approving the daring project, would not take on themselves the least responsibility for its adoption. William alone deserves the credit for so complete a breach with the tradition that the Main Fleet must be back in its harbours before the autumn storms. It was an order no admiral of the day would have ventured to give. Russell's complaint that the King 'fancies the defects of a ship are as easily repaired as mending a bridle or stirrup-leather' indicates the attitude of the sailors, in whose eyes the technical and professional objections to the step had an importance which the King did not attribute to them. William saw that, unless the fleet could keep its position, his great stroke would sink to the rank of a mere demonstration, and that at all hazards the advantage gained in the Mediterranean must be maintained. And so, when Russell reached Malaga on his way home, he was intercepted by a vessel which brought, 'under the sign manual and royal signet,' William's orders that the fleet should winter at Cadiz.

It is this, then, even more than the mere despatch of the fleet to the Mediterranean, which was the decisive stroke. With the allies in command of the Mediterranean, Louis' attempt to force Spain and Savoy to make peace was baffled. The invasion of Catalonia resulted in a failure which left the army of De Noailles demoralised. Savoy remained true to the Grand Alliance, and the French conquests in Italy were checked. Moreover, the refitting at Cadiz proved an easier task than Russell had feared; and 1695 saw the allies in complete control of the Mediterranean, though without troops Russell could not deal the blow against Marseilles by which he hoped to fetch Tourville out to sea. Savoy, on whose co-operation he counted, proved a broken reed, for Louis, foiled by William's brilliant strategy in his attempt to coerce Savoy into deserting the League, was now seeking to seduce the Duke by concessions of which the collusive surrender of Casale was the first. In September Russell was at last allowed to turn his face homeward with the

heavier ships; but Rooke and a fresh division replaced him, and William kept his hold on the Mediterranean.

Then it was that Louis had recourse to a daring counter-stroke by which he hoped to free France from 'the silent pressure of the chafing fleet that was felt to the farthest borders of the war, . . . withering the lilies on the walls of Namur. . . . In mid-winter, while the bulk of the British fleet was in harbour, a force was rapidly concentrated at Calais' for the undertaking by which, a century later, Napoleon also sought to shake off the pressure of British sea-power. To prevent this threatened invasion, the reinforcements for the Mediterranean had to be stopped and Rooke recalled. 'The situation in the Narrow Seas was saved, but that in the Mediterranean was lost.' Château-Réault was able to quit Toulon and make his way to Brest, Rooke just failing to intercept him; and the financial situation in England made it impossible to repeat the splendid move which had done more than anything else to check Louis. 'Still its effects continued'; and the Peace of Ryswick was in no small measure a recognition of William's power to influence Europe through the Mediterranean.

Still more do the negotiations over the Spanish Succession testify to the fact that both Louis and William appreciated the possibilities of British naval action in the Mediterranean. Both saw clearly that the possession of the Peninsula meant the power to dominate 'the keyboard of Europe.' Cadiz, already important as the seat of Spain's American trade, had acquired even greater value from its position near the Straits. If it passed into French hands, William could not hope to repeat the strategy of 1694-1695 unless he could obtain an adequate substitute, not merely a port in the Mediterranean where a British squadron could winter and refit, but a station near enough to the Straits to enable him to profit by the division of the French seats of naval power by preventing the junction of the Brest and Toulon fleets. No one port exactly fulfilled both these conditions; but of the two which ultimately fell to England's lot in 1713, Port Mahon, the best harbour in the Mediterranean, was admirably placed for watching Toulon, and Gibraltar dominates the Straits as far as any fortress can. In the tortuous negotiations over the Partition Treaty,

William's indispensable condition was that, if Spain fell to the lot of a Frenchman, England must have at least Minorca. Louis resisted the demand with all his diplomatic skill, but William was inexorable; and in the end, rather than see England securely established in the Mediterranean, Louis agreed to let Spain and the Indies go to the Electoral Prince of Bavaria. And, when the will of Charles II put Spain into Bourbon hands, the first act of Louis was to urge on the Junta the necessity of taking steps to secure Cadiz, Gibraltar, and Port Mahon.

The true story of the first important naval venture of the Spanish Succession war—for Mr Corbett has successfully discredited the ordinary accounts which see in Rooke's expedition against Cadiz merely a blow at the European depôt of the Spanish trade with America—throws an extremely instructive light on William as a naval strategist. It shows how thoroughly he had appreciated the lessons of 1694. As planned by him, the expedition was primarily directed against France, not against Spain, to secure the all-important port at the entrance to the Mediterranean, the seizure of which would at once place England in a position of strategical advantage over the divided French squadrons and provide William's admirals with a harbour in which they could securely winter. The expedition would probably have sailed under William's auspices in the late summer of 1701, but for Rooke's reluctance to risk his 'great ships' to the southward so late in the season; and next year William's death and the consequent changes at the Admiralty again seriously retarded its departure.

When at last it set out, it resulted in a complete fiasco, which Rooke and Ormond were fortunate to be able to redeem in some degree by the brilliant exploit on the Plate fleet at Vigo. For the failure Captain Stephen Martin, in his *Life*,* is inclined to throw the blame on Ormond and the troops; but, bad as their conduct was, Rooke's responsibility is quite as heavy. A man of little imagination, he failed to appreciate William's strategy as developed by Marlborough, disliked the plan he was

* Edited by Sir Clements Markham for the Navy Records Society in 1895, a work which has been used to good account by Mr Corbett, as has also another of the Society's volumes, the 'Journal of Sir George Rooke,' published in 1897.

ordered to execute, and sought to substitute for it one of his own, the main object of which was to intercept and capture the home-coming Plate fleet. Indeed he seems to have been in his bed all the time the expedition was at Cadiz, and, either from genuine ill-health or, what seems at least as probable, from ill-temper, did nothing to ensure success. It is not, indeed, fair to represent him as having stumbled on the Plate fleet by accident; he thought only too much about it and took every precaution to ensure its being found. Still, his success in this secondary undertaking cannot diminish his responsibility for the failure of the far more important attack on Cadiz, an undertaking which was part and parcel of a strategic design which Rooke was almost as incapable of appreciating as of framing.

As on land Marlborough took up the torch of William and won successes which have perhaps a little unfairly thrown into the shade the merits of his patient, indomitable, and unlucky predecessor, so in the field of naval strategy Marlborough eclipsed even the man who had first directed the Main Fleet to the Mediterranean and kept it there in spite of nervous admirals and faint-hearted councillors. William had grasped the strategical value of Minorca and Cadiz, and saw that, based on them, the British fleet might hold the navy of France in check and dominate the Mediterranean. Marlborough divined that Minorca and Cadiz were but milestones on the road to Toulon, the true key to the European situation.

Mr Corbett's last four chapters tell the tale of the great strategist's persistent endeavours to turn the key. They put the naval side of the Spanish Succession war in an entirely new light. Just as the Mediterranean, not the trade of Spanish America, had been the goal of William's designs on Cadiz, so the true object of Marlborough's Mediterranean strategy is not to be found in the support given by the fleet to the Hapsburg cause in Spain. That was a mere diversion, if not a hindrance to the success of the allied arms; 'it was the command of the Mediterranean that was the real object, and Toulon the ultimate objective.' Thus in every campaign from 1702 to 1707 it is on Toulon that Marlborough's hopes are fixed. It was with a view to attacking Toulon that he proposed in 1706 to transfer himself and his British

troops to the assistance of Prince Eugene in Italy—a project he would probably have carried out had not the sudden retreat of Louis of Baden alarmed the Dutch and made them withdraw their consent.

With his keen grip of strategical principles, Marlborough would never permit secondary or masking operations as long as there was any chance of a successful stroke at the heart. Far-reaching as was the importance of the capture of Gibraltar, it was not the object of the Mediterranean campaign of 1704. The results have obscured the true purpose of the operations of that year. Rooke's move on Barcelona was a mere feint; he had been sent out to co-operate with the Duke of Savoy in a direct attack on Toulon; and it was only when the Duke proved unable to provide the military force without which even the most powerful fleet can achieve but meagre results, that Rooke fell back on the alternative contemplated in his instructions and captured Gibraltar. That, in attempting Gibraltar, Rooke was displaying any fearless readiness to accept responsibility cannot be maintained. As Mr Corbett says, 'the idea was a commonplace, both in the Cabinet and in the service.'

The immediate importance of the capture was that it brought the Toulon fleet out and was the occasion of the only fleet-action of the war, the stoutly contested battle of Malaga. The tactical features of that engagement are admirably explained by Mr Corbett, who shows that, so far from being of 'no military interest,' and quite without any tactics worth the name, as Captain Mahan has represented it, it is of great importance as a phase in the development of the tactics of the line, and gave occasion for some very neat and skilful manœuvres. Nor was it indecisive. 'If battles are judged by their fruits, it was Rooke who had won' no inconsiderable victory. Toulouse had come out to retake Gibraltar; Rooke had fought to cover and retain it. Toulouse took his shattered fleet back to Toulon after declining to renew the action; Gibraltar remained in British hands. Moreover, never again in the war did the French venture a general action or seriously contest the control of the Mediterranean.

Next to the campaign of 1704 that of 1707 possesses most interest. In it Eugene at last got a chance of carrying out the darling project of his great colleague.

The failure of the attack on Toulon, a failure by a rather narrow margin, must not be laid to his door. Its causes were numerous. Galway's defeat at Almanza prevented any British troops being withdrawn from Spain for an object whose success would have done far more to place the Archduke on the Spanish throne than many a barren triumphal entry into Madrid. The Emperor's eagerness to secure Naples caused the diversion of the larger part of the Imperial forces to an enterprise of secondary importance, for Naples also might have been won at Toulon. Finally, the delays and obstinacy of the Duke of Savoy were largely instrumental in allowing Marshal Tessé to collect so large a defending force that surprise was made impossible and success hopeless.

Foiled in his effort to strike France at a vital point, Marlborough fell back on the less satisfactory 'expedient of masking the fortress with a naval force permanently on the spot'; and to do this it was essential to obtain a port in which the British fleet could winter and refit. Something more than a mere cruiser-station was wanted; for, great as is the strategical value of Gibraltar, it is only now, two hundred years after its capture, that it can be said to have become a real naval base. Louis knew well what England needed; and the French garrison he had thrown into Port Mahon proved the principal obstacle encountered by Stanhope, when, with Leake's invaluable aid, he made himself master of the island. The desperate struggles of the French negotiators at Utrecht against England's firm resolve to retain possession of the two naval stations which the war had placed in her hands, the jealous protests of the Dutch, the sullen hostility of the Emperor—these are sufficient testimony to the importance of England's new acquisitions. Not even the Tories' bitter hatred of Marlborough could blind them to the value of the work he had done in the Mediterranean; and so the Peace of Utrecht 'set the seal on the work which Ward, the pirate, had disreputably begun.' With the acquisition of a permanent foothold in 'the ancient basin of dominion,' the establishment of England's naval power as an abiding factor in the Mediterranean situation was complete.

Art. II.—THE CRY OF THE CHILDREN.

1. *Baby-farming; Infant Life Insurance; The Child of the English Savage*, and other essays. By Rev. Benjamin Waugh. London: Kegan Paul, 1888-90.
2. *The Law Relating to Children*. By W. Clarke Hall. London: Stevens, 1894.
3. *Juvenile Offenders*. By W. D. Morrison. London: Fisher Unwin, 1896.
4. *The Queen's Reign for Children*. By W. Clarke Hall. London: Fisher Unwin, 1897.
5. *The Law Relating to Child-saving and Reformatory Efforts*. By A. J. S. Maddison, London Reformatory and Refuge Union, 1900.
6. *The Treatment of Juvenile Offenders*. By Rosa M. Barrett. (Howard Medal Essay.) London, 1900.
7. *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury*. By Edwin Hodder. Three vols. London: Cassell, 1886.
8. *Reports of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children*, 1889-1905.
9. *Juvenile Offenders*. Howard Association Report, 1900.
10. *The Child's Guardian*. London, 1887-1905.

And other works and reports.

ONE of the last public functions in which Queen Victoria was engaged was a children's review held in the Phoenix Park, Dublin, during her visit to Ireland in the spring of 1900, when some 50,000 of her young subjects assembled from all parts of the country to see and welcome the great Queen. Those who had the good fortune to be present are not likely to forget that wonderful spectacle and the profound impressions which it made. It was a happy thought of the quick-witted Irish people to suggest a function, at once so commendable and so singularly in accordance with the whole life-work of the aged monarch. From her accession to the day of her death the happiness, the welfare, and the interests of the most helpless of all her subjects were never absent from her mind. It was therefore most pleasing to her to meet the children, for it was the means adopted by the nation of thankfully recognising the blessings she had bestowed upon them, by giving her royal assent to so many measures passed for their welfare during her memorable reign.

Tradition and custom die hard; and of all our traditions none has been more persistent than that which declares that an Englishman's home is his castle, and that a man has a right to do what he likes with his children. Parental control was practically unlimited among the races through which the Western nations have received most of their religion and many of their legal notions; and the extreme rights of the parent over the child were not only accepted, but were never seriously called in question until our own day. Parental rights were considered too sacred for interference; child-suffering was viewed with callous indifference; and a rigidity of discipline was practised which public opinion no longer permits. As a subject of the Crown, the child had practically no rights; and, until a few years ago, its claim for food, clothing, and such decent treatment as would make life just possible, were things unknown to English law. The change that has come over the mind of the nation in recent years in its attitude towards children is one of the most striking recorded in our annals; and the reforms that have been instituted in their condition are among the most beneficent in the late Queen's reign. On her accession in 1837, there was not a single Act on the Statute-book of England framed for the welfare of children; ere she died she had set her sign-manual to over one hundred. The full history of this great reformation has yet to be written, but the time is not yet; for, although the foundations have been well laid, and much of the superstructure raised, yet much remains to be done for the happiness and welfare of children. Mr Clarke Hall in his admirable sketch has traversed the field; and, if we appear to follow his lead, it is because our own enquiries long ago led us over the same ground.

There are many now living who are old enough to remember when children were, in all senses of the word, slaves in factories, mines, brickfields, and other occupations both by land and sea. The child-criminal was as much an object of prey for the talons of the law as the adult-criminal; he was tried like a felon, condemned like a felon, and transported or hanged like a felon. The apathy, the callous indifference, the ignorance and greed which fostered the child-slavery of the mines and work-shops, fostered also the many homeless waifs who drifted

into such gangs as those of Fagin the Jew, made such a criminal youthful prodigy as the Artful Dodger possible, and flung upon the streets the child that grew into a ruffian like Bill Sykes. And so long as England has its armies of criminals, so long as hooliganism is rampant in its great centres of population, the legislative work for the welfare and reformation of children is incomplete.

Little in the way of public philanthropy was accomplished in England before the end of the eighteenth century; and the Hanoverian period as a whole was anything but fertile in measures for the reform of vicious habits or the suppression of vice. Many of those qualities of the race that we are inclined to consider virtues when we look back through the ages, would now be considered pre-eminently brutal; and Hogarth's 'Progress of Cruelty' is a satire as terrible as it is deserved. The great industrial revival that commenced at the end of the eighteenth century, the rapid increase of population, and the spread of great towns, brought with them new social problems of great complexity and difficulty. The demand for labour was immensely increased under the impetus of the new industries; and child-labour, resulting in the gravest evils, was only too readily employed for working machines which required little physical strength. The old Poor Law greatly aggravated the evil, for it not only put a premium on illegitimacy, but authorised the guardians to supply the factories with young children from five or six years old, like cattle or sheep, at so much a head, without the slightest restriction. Thousands of children were thus sent as 'apprentices' from all parts of the kingdom, especially to the busy centres of Lancashire and Yorkshire, where the owners and overseers of the factories and workshops, whether kind or unkind, had unlimited power over them. Parents contracted for their children in the same manner; and to such an extent was the system carried, that in a noted case a number of children were put up for auction as part of a bankrupt's property. In another instance it was disclosed that a London parish had arranged to supply a factory in Lancashire with children, on the understanding that one idiot child should be taken off their hands with every twenty sound children sent.

Even in the best-regulated factories the life of the

children was one of slavery. The gangs often worked day and night in turn, the average number of hours being from twelve to fourteen; but sixteen to eighteen were not uncommon. The child 'apprentice' who survived years of excessive labour, bad air, and insufficient food, was, when he got his release at the age of twenty-one, generally so enfeebled, and so stunted in mind and body, that he was ill-qualified for the future struggle for existence. The death-rate among such children was abnormally high; and physical cruelty was often added to their other miseries. It was chiefly due to the efforts of Lord Ashley (afterwards Lord Shaftesbury) that, after a struggle of about thirty years, a good working Factory Act was passed (1844) to check these fearful evils; and the parliamentary enquiries and debates which led up to it furnish painful reading.

Evil as were the conditions under which children worked in factories, they were intensified in the mines; and the Report of the Commission of Enquiry (1842) reveals a revolting and scandalous state of affairs. Women and young children worked in the mines through long weary hours, filling and dragging the coal, and sometimes picking it like men. The girls engaged in dragging the coal wore trousers, and a belt was fastened round the waist, to which a chain was attached that passed between the legs and hooked on to the car. They crawled on all fours, pulling the heavy load behind them; the belt and chain frayed and blistered the skin; and the passages through which they crawled were often so low that the back was sore from knocking against the roof.* Boys and girls, men and women, often worked together in a semi-nude state, the men occasionally being nearly naked. In many pits no attempt was made to check the worst evils of the system, or to improve the conditions under which the sexes, young and old, worked together—conditions which were an outrage on all decency. The bare facts alone, without any elaboration of details, are sufficient to create in the mind a hideous picture of the awful condition of the children doomed from infancy to labour in the mines—for even a child of three could hold a candle

* In that extraordinary and now forgotten work, 'The Mysteries of London,' G. W. M. Reynolds gives a revolting description of female labour in the mines, no doubt based upon the Report of the Commission.

and be a wage-earner—with never a sight of daylight except on Sunday; the physical fatigue and pain, the frequent cruelty of the miners under whom they worked. Many died under the strain; brutish dullness and pitiful despair marked the countenances of those who survived.

The evidence produced by Lord Ashley in his speech on the Bill of 1842 made a profound impression, not only in Parliament, but throughout the land. How it affected the Queen we know by a letter from the Prince Consort, published in Lord Shaftesbury's 'Life,' in which he says: 'I have no doubt but that the whole country must be with you; at all events, I can assure you that the Queen is, whom your statements have filled with the deepest sympathy.' The Report was one of the most effective ever presented to Parliament; and a Bill regulating labour in mines was carried, but only after a vigorous struggle. It was followed by another, thirty years later, and again by one in 1887. Female and child-labour have long been abolished, not only in mines, but also in the shunting of railway waggons at the pit's mouth.

There is no more significant example of the difficulty of carrying remedial measures for suffering children than the long and painful struggle on behalf of chimney-sweepers. So early as 1760 public attention was called to the evils under which children of tender years suffered at this most painful and deadly occupation; but not until more than a century had elapsed was this stone of reproach, after many ineffectual attempts, rolled away from the door that gave them liberty and life. Children were sold by parents or poor-law guardians to the master-sweepers; and kidnapping was a common enough practice in this cruel trade. The report of a select committee, published in 1817, is a revolting record of the miseries endured by, and the cruelties perpetrated on, the unfortunate children condemned to this abominable way of life. Boys and girls of five or six years old were sent up chimneys, sometimes so narrow that they got jammed and had to be cut out by breaking in the wall. Protected by nothing but a ragged shirt, the skin of knees and elbows was invariably broken; and the ankles became crooked from the distortion and strain of climbing. The children suffered intensely from the masters' practice of rubbing the bodies with brine in order to harden the skin; their

eyes got bleared from soot and dirt; and in time cancer was developed in the scrotum from want of cleanliness, and was a recognised disease of the trade. Straw was lighted to force them to ascend quickly; and they were beaten and bruised with the brush or other weapon for the slightest offence. Deaths occurred from time to time by choking and suffocation in the flues. It was a common practice to send them up chimneys on fire in order to extinguish it, when they were drenched with water poured down from above. They had to carry heavy loads of tools, cloths, and soot; they were ill-clad and suffered intensely from the cold in winter, as most of their work was done in the early hours of the morning; they were ill-fed and slept in sheds or cellars on the soot-bags in their wretched rags; and they went for months, and even a year, without the use of soap and water.

Charles Lamb saw the pathos of the child chimney-sweeper, and described his condition with his rare delicacy of feeling and all the charm of his imaginative fancy:—

‘I reverence these young Africans of our own growth—these almost clergy imps, who sport their cloth without assumption, and from their little pulpits (the tops of chimneys), in the nipping air of a December morning, preach a lesson of patience to mankind.’

The general attitude of the public, however, may be gauged from an article by Sidney Smith in the ‘Edinburgh Review’ (1819). While giving a qualified approval of the action of the friends of chimney-sweepers, and wishing for ‘the diminution of their numbers and the limitation of their trade,’ he says:—

‘After all, we must own that it was quite right to throw out the Bill for prohibiting the sweeping of chimneys by boys, because humanity is a modern invention, and there are many chimneys in old houses which cannot possibly be swept in any other manner. . . . Such a measure, we are convinced from the evidence, could not be carried into execution without great injury to property, and great increased risk of fire.

Has there ever been a measure of reformation of any kind promoted that has not touched on some ‘property,’ vested interest, or individual rights? Mercy was withheld from the chimney-sweepers until Lord Ashley took

up their cause, and, after much opposition, carried two Acts, which, however, were ineffectual, chiefly from want of public sanction and apathy on the part of the authorities in enforcing them. Magistrates were often slow to convict; and, when they did so, the master-sweepers contributed to pay the fines. The principle of these and many other Acts of Parliament, passed to remedy the evils under which children suffered, rested upon the absurd assumption that the child knew the law and could take steps to have its rights vindicated; hence the failure of law alone to remedy children's wrongs, or to secure their happiness and welfare. It was not till 1875, when the heart of the nation had been stirred by the death of a boy at Cambridge, that Lord Shaftesbury succeeded in carrying a satisfactory measure. This Act, public opinion, and the general adoption of improved mechanical appliances, finally gave relief to the friendless and miserable beings who, for over a century, had appealed for it in vain.

There were other quarters also, even in the open air of heaven, where the evils arising from child-labour were every whit as deplorable as in mines, workshops, and chimney-sweeping. A system of agricultural labour had been organised in the eastern counties of England, under which gangs of labourers travelled about from place to place under the management of a 'gang-master,' or were formed by the farmers themselves. The gangs consisted of young women and children of both sexes, the ages of the latter varying from six to thirteen. It was estimated that about 20,000 persons were engaged in agricultural labour under this system. In 1865 Lord Shaftesbury obtained the extension of the reference to a Commission of Enquiry, appointed in 1862, so as to include within its scope the employment of children in agricultural gangs. This Commission reported in 1867-9. The evils disclosed were as shocking as anything brought to light by public enquiry into the conditions of child-labour in England. In weather wet or dry, in heat and cold, hunger and thirst, early and late, young children tramped the English shires, and were often dragged many miles to and from their daily labour. They often suffered brutal ill-treatment from the gang-master. Colds, rheumatism, chest or lung diseases, were generally their lot; and the death-

rate was abnormally high, as much as three times that of the normal conditions of life in a rural district. Workhouses and hospitals gave evidence of pitiful and revolting cases, in which the curse—for such it was to them—of motherhood had fallen on girls of thirteen and fourteen, blighting their young lives and stamping a double measure of iniquity upon them, by a cruel and relentless fate. On the strength of the Report of the Commission Lord Ashley succeeded, in 1867, in carrying an Act which put an end to this abominable system.

Equally injurious to the health and happiness of children was their labour in brickfields. Some 30,000 children, the greater number of whom were girls of ages from three and a half upwards, were sent to labour in brickfields from fourteen to sixteen hours a day.

‘I saw’ (said Lord Ashley, in introducing a measure for their relief in the House of Lords) ‘little children, three parts naked, tottering under the weight of wet clay, some of it on their heads and some on their shoulders, and little girls with large masses of wet, cold, and dripping clay pressing on the abdomen. Moreover, the unhappy children were exposed, to the most sudden transitions of heat and cold; for, after carrying their burdens of wet clay, they had to endure the heat of the kiln and to enter places where the heat was so fierce that I was not myself able to remain more than two or three minutes.’

Parliament and the country had become more educated since Lord Ashley brought in the first Factory Act (1833), based on the Report of the Commission appointed at the instigation of Mr Sadler, member for Aldborough. The miseries of the brickfield children were ameliorated by the Factory and Workshops Act of 1871, and were finally removed by other measures.

Towards juvenile offenders the attitude of mind of the nation and the general administration of the law are very different from what these were a century ago. Then, and for long afterwards, no distinction was made between the child and the adult in cases of felony, and felony included what would now be trifling offences. Children, if convicted, suffered the extreme penalty of the law. While waiting for trial at the assizes, they were herded with the vilest refuse of the prison population; and thus,

whether innocent or guilty, during imprisonment they graduated in vice in the worst of all possible schools. The discovery of offenders and the forcible suppression of crime by vigorous punishment were the main objects of the authorities; to its ulterior causes and the possibility of their removal they paid little attention.

The Care and Education of Infants Convicted of Felony Act (1840) and the Juvenile Offenders Act (1847) were beneficial innovations. The Summary Jurisdiction Act of 1879 and the First Offenders Act (1887) still further extended the powers of magistrates. In dealing with youthful offenders, the justices now have a wide option. They may bind over the parents and make them responsible; they may inflict fines or whipping on the offenders themselves, or send them to prison or to reformatories or industrial schools. The criminal habit in the young differs greatly in degree, if not in kind, from that of the adult. In the former it is, at the outset, seldom of a serious nature; but it increases in strength as the child grows to manhood until it becomes almost ineradicable. Hence the urgent necessity of using every preventive means with vagrant and other children, who are likely to drift into the current of crime through the channels of vagabondage and petty thieving.

In 1837 Parkhurst was established as a prison for juvenile offenders under sentence of transportation; and the experience acquired was of importance in the reformatory scheme of which it was the precursor. In 1849 Red Hill was instituted, under the auspices of the Philanthropic Society; and, after several legislative attempts, the first Reformatory Schools Act was passed by Lord Palmerston in 1854. It is not necessary here to trace the history of the changes and reforms which have since been introduced into the reformatory and industrial schools systems. In the reformatory system the punitive idea was originally dominant; and, down to 1893, committal to the schools was preceded by a short term of imprisonment. This practice still holds in Ireland. It is not even yet fully recognised that much difference exists between the criminal acts of a child and those of an adult. A child has less reason for his actions; the tendency to imitate is strong; and with evil example ever before him he naturally turns to wrong-doing. He

has little sense of responsibility, and little idea of the evil effects of his misdoings upon himself and others. Nor can he always clearly distinguish between what is merely wrong and what constitutes a crime.

Too much stress cannot be laid upon the truth that the child is unable to change the conditions which are the main factor in causing him to offend. These conditions, as we have already pointed out, are the same that give rise to other pressing social problems. The changes in the industrial life of the nation have led to the concentration of millions of people in very limited areas. In these the struggle for existence is intensified; poverty, disease, vice, and drink, lower or vitiate the standard of parental control, or deprive children of it altogether. The proportion of vagrants, waifs and strays, and orphans in cities is much greater than in rural districts; and in the struggle of life the odds are heavily against them. The great majority of juvenile offenders are of a low standard of physical development; and, as a class, they are both mentally and morally deficient. Most juvenile offenders learn bad habits in the streets of great cities. The child who has the run of the streets is almost sure to graduate in vice in some form or other. The child-beggar or seller of newspapers, matches, or bootlaces seldom turns to good account as he grows up to manhood. It has been found in some cities that from 60 to 70 per cent. of the children committed to industrial schools have been street-hawkers. We have grave doubts whether the attempts to regulate street-hawking by licenses will eliminate the evils attending the practice.

The facilities afforded by the industrial school system have been largely utilised. The committals average about 4500 a year; the number of youths and children detained is over 25,000; and a sum of about 550,000*l.* is annually spent upon the schools. Owing to the establishment of these classes of schools, to the introduction of punishment by whipping, and to the general working of the First Offenders Act, the number of juvenile prisoners is now only about a sixth of what it was some fifty years ago. But, notwithstanding the success attending the schools in this direction, the enormous number of offences committed by persons from sixteen to twenty-one years of age shows that much yet remains to be done with the youth of the

country who feed the criminal class. The police court, the dock, and the jail are the worst possible means of dealing with juvenile offenders. Familiarity breeds contempt; and the shock of the first conviction is soon obliterated by the second. Measures have recently been taken, especially in our larger cities, to change the surroundings attending the committal of children, to shorten the formalities, and to prevent all association with adult offenders. But, until we have special courts for children's cases, and a special state department for children (which the magnitude of the work to be done demands), we shall not have reached the goal to which we are struggling.

An important principle was introduced into the reformatory and industrial schools by the institution of a system of inspection in 1866. The wisdom of the step is evident; but it is difficult to see why, in the forty years that have since elapsed, the system has not been applied to all orphanages and homes for children. In regard to sanitation, food, air, light, and clothing—in short, to all that conduces to health and comfort, as much supervision is required in the one class of institutions as in the other. Cases discovered by the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children show that institutions have existed in which, through ignorance or wilful neglect, disease, suffering, and death have fallen upon the unhappy inmates of these misnamed 'homes.' On grounds of mere precaution, as well as to give confidence to those on whom such houses depend for support, every home and kindred institution for children should be registered and subjected to periodic inspection.

Under the existing laws relating to industrial schools, as was pointed out by the Departmental Committee of Enquiry in 1896, nothing is easier than for parents to rid themselves of their responsibilities and have their children brought up at the expense of the ratepayers. To send them into the streets to beg, to let them wander habitually without proper guardianship or visible means of subsistence, to drive them, by ill-treatment or want, to commit some petty theft—such are some of the ready means by which cruel or heartless parents can rid themselves of their children. If all parents did their duty to their children, there would be little necessity for reformatories or industrial schools. Such a state of

perfection is not to be expected; but all facilities for evading responsibilities should be removed. That the magistrates and police authorities exercise discretion and judgment we fully believe; the faults lie in the law itself rather than in the administration of it. The preservation of the home, the inculcation of domestic habits, the strengthening of domestic ties, and the enforcement of parental responsibilities are weightier factors in the welfare of the State than the removal of children to any institution however perfect.

The several Acts for the prevention of cruelty to children prove an admirable check, when properly enforced, upon the tendency to evade parental duties. The fact that many hundreds of children who had been removed to places of safety while their parents were undergoing imprisonment for cruelty towards them, were returned, on the parents' release, with excellent results, shows what can be done by applying methods more rational and humane than the drastic one of severing all ties and committing the children to industrial schools. But that children, after acquiring good habits in industrial schools, should go back to parents who have deliberately got rid of them and contributed nothing to their support in the meantime, is open to obvious objections. It is only too likely that the children will return to the old thriftless habits, and that all the good done and the money spent in doing it will be thrown away. How best to deal with the worthless parents is a difficult problem. They have been permitted by society to become what they are—a disgrace to national civilisation and a menace to national prosperity and peace. The children of such men, driven into the streets to make a living at a time when they should be getting their first instruction at school, become very Ishmaelites, and early learn the lesson of warfare against society. Cruelly neglected, kicked, battered, and bruised, with every instinct for good crushed out and every instinct for evil stimulated by brutality, how can they be expected to grow up anything but savages, devoid of conscience and of respect for God or man?

Whatever difference of opinion there may be on the question of the reclamation of the adult criminal, there is none as to the use of methods of reformation for the young. To the hardened criminal punitive methods

seem alone applicable; yet their efficiency is limited, for they appeal only to the sense of fear. If the severity of punishment could prevent crime, it would long ago have disappeared in all civilised States. On a broad view of the question, it is evident that abnormal conditions of life constitute the main cause of crime, and contribute the permanent supply of criminals. How to amend these abnormal conditions is, through the growing complexity of our social life, a problem of ever-increasing difficulty which we cannot deal with here. But as the youthful offender is, directly or indirectly, the product of these abnormal conditions, his reformation is not only a moral duty, but on merely selfish grounds the business of the State. To punish children as criminals for what they could not help doing is as stupid as it is cruel; the only remedy is to take the young offender out of his evil environment, to educate him in habits of thrift and right conduct, and to make him useful both to himself and to his kind. Yet this is a principle which we have learnt from bitter experience only in recent times, and the application of which still leaves much to be desired.

The harmonising and simplification of the various Acts of Parliament relating to industrial schools is a matter of pressing necessity. Much confusion exists in regard to the proper classification of children admitted to them; and no real distinction is drawn between those who are tainted with vice and those who are merely orphans or destitute. All schools of the kind should be of modest dimensions, and should be made as homelike, and as free from prison-like surroundings, as is compatible with the safe housing and efficient training of the inmates. The same principle should be applied to workhouses; and the boarding-out, or cottage-home method should be adopted so far as possible. It is impossible for children mewed up within the huge walls of existing workhouses to grow up with domestic instincts, or to know the meaning of the word 'home.' As with orphanages, there should be frequent and systematic inspection.

The phases of child-suffering with which we have already dealt were so glaring as to call for remedial legislation, although redress came only after a long and painful struggle. But there are other evils as great,

wrongs as cruel, and suffering as acute, within the child's home, and hidden from the public eye, of which society has long seemed oblivious, and which the law, till lately, did not touch. Public opinion and the law of the land long ago made cruelty to animals a punishable offence, and prohibited the torture of animals in training for public performance in the circus or elsewhere. But the State looked with apathy and indifference on the child; it not only denied to children the common rights of citizenship, but it denied them within the home the rights which it conferred upon the meanest cur. The law confirmed the rights and authority of the parent over the child, and of the taskmaster over the apprentice, but it neglected to enforce parental duties and responsibilities, or to protect the child from ill-treatment at the hands of those who had given it life.

No one who had any experience of the lives of the poor in crowded cities doubted that much misery and suffering fell upon children; but it was a startling proposition that the children of this country required the strong arm of the law to shield them against parental tyranny. Admirable work was being done, notably by Dr Barnardo, whose death is a national loss, among out-cast, homeless, and ill-treated children. But, as the years went on, there was no diminution in the need for efforts on behalf of such children; obvious child-misery remained undiminished; and how to deal with the cause of the misery that lay concealed within the home was a problem still unsolved. It was not until a society was started, definitely pledged to the prevention of cruelty to children, that a policy was formulated which seemed to strike at the root of the evil—an evil which hundreds of State and voluntary institutions had hitherto done little to amend.

The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children was founded in 1884 by the Rev. Benjamin Waugh. He found in his work, as a Congregational minister in London, that children suffered many wrongs for which existing social machinery supplied no remedy. Gifted with a keen insight into children's wants, a passionate sympathy with child-suffering, and a quick perception of the remedies to be applied, and combining a lofty enthusiasm with sanity of judgment and organising power, he in a short time succeeded in showing, not only the

need for such a society, but the glaring defects of the law of the land as regards the natural rights of the child. Although at first it was regarded by the public with coolness and even dislike, the results of the society's work revealed in a few years a painful state of affairs, and profoundly affected all those who gave ear to the pitiful record. Cases of cruelty, suffering, and nameless wrongs were found not only in the vile slums of cities, in ruinous attic and murky cellar, but in the wide thoroughfares, in wealthy homes as well as in the homes of the poor, in rural villages, and in the select haunts of fashionable life. It was a shock to many to discover what was concealed beneath the thin veneer of our vaunted nineteenth century civilisation.

The apathy of generations, the mistaken notion of liberty which recognised the parent's rights and ignored the child's wrongs, and the encouragement given to wicked people by mistaken benevolence were largely responsible for the state of affairs disclosed by the Society. It was a bitter comment on the nation's attitude that it permitted thousands of men and women, in whom the springs of parental instinct were atrophied and the bonds of natural affection withered, not only to remain insensible to their children's pain and suffering, but to lay cruel hands upon them, and by violence and neglect to be the cause of physical injury, or even death. It was found that in 'Merry England,' ever ready to vindicate the rights of afflicted races against oppression and wrong, and willing to spend millions in stamping out African slavery, there existed a mass of bondage and cruelty as heartless as any that ever polluted Neapolitan prisons or American plantations. There is no more terrible reading in the social history of the nineteenth century than the Society's simple records; there is none so pathetic, none so well calculated to rouse the indignation of every right-minded man and woman who has heart to feel and head to grasp the intensity and the magnitude of this persistent evil. We quote a passage from a branch report, dated 1890-1, showing that London was not the only place where offences were committed against the lives and welfare of children, and every statement in which we can certify:—

'We have found children who, day after day and night after night, had to take shelter on staircases, in cellars, and

passages, driven there in terror by their parents. We have found an infant left in a cellar where no ray of light ever penetrated, lying in cold and dirt, and no hand to relieve it from its misery or tend its little wants. We have found children nearly naked crouching over the bars of a grate with a few cinders therein, cold, shivering, half-starved, diseased, covered with vermin and hard incrustations of scabs and dirt. We have found them locked in rooms from early morning till late at night without a fire, with wretched garments, so unwashed and unkempt that for two months neither soap nor water had been used upon them. We have found children literally starved to death. We have known an infant child two months old who, crying in its cradle, was struck by its brutal father on the spine and brought to the hospital in convulsions. We have found infants drunk at the breast while the besotted mothers lay helpless on the floor. We have known of children suffering from *delirium tremens* at the age of eight; of infants suffering from *meningitis* from a blow on the head; suffering from a broken thigh, and other injuries, from the kicks of drunken parents. We found one so emaciated that the prison doctor declared "it was not fit to be lifted out of the gutter." We have found them kicked into the streets "to sink or swim" as they liked; and one of the brightest-faced lads we have seen was suffering from *chorea* and deafness from such ill-treatment. Scars ran along each side of the head, one received from a heavy shop-weight thrown at him, and the other from a blow of a heavy mallet. Not a day passes that some such case does not come before us of children neglected, abused, ill-treated by cruel, selfish, brutal, and drunken parents.'

This horrible catalogue of child-suffering—and yet worse could be told—is more like the creation of some hideous nightmare, or the fanciful conception of a Dantean hell than the record of actual, ascertained fact. There is not a weapon ready to hand that has not been used by fireside tyrants upon their tender offspring. In a paper by Mr Waugh, 'On Some Conditions of Child Life in England' (1889), he says:—

'Besides canes, straps, whips, and boots, belts and thongs of rope, the instruments of torture have been hammers, pokers cold and hot, wire toasting-forks—in one case the prongs of the fork hammered out, the stem untwisted a little up, making a sort of birch of frayed wire; a file, with which the skin on projecting bones had been rasped raw; a hot stove,

on which the child's bare thighs were put; hot fire grates, against which little hands were held.'

The overwhelming majority of the offences against young children are committed by the earners of good wages. Poverty does not necessarily involve cruelty; and against the poor as a body no such charge can be made. Gambling and abandonment to drink and vice are the main causes of the wrongs done to children. But there are many cases in which these causes do not apply. There is a refinement of cruelty sometimes practised which can only be accounted for by the fact that the culprit takes pleasure in the infliction of pain, a physical delight in human suffering, all the more abominable in that the sufferer is powerless to defend itself against the torturer. The records of the National Society reveal the fact that this type of cruelty is more common than people think, and by no means confined to the working or lower classes. To such monsters in human guise the law should show no mercy.

The Society early recognised the magnitude of the evil of child-suffering, and perceived that it was a national one. As an organisation it differed, in the means which it adopted, from all others which had for their object the rescue and welfare of children. It invoked the aid of the law; it called upon Parliament to enact new statutes, since it found those existing totally inadequate; and it enforced them by means of an organisation designed for the purpose. The Society clearly saw that the unit of national corporate life is the home; and it has never attempted the impossible task of removing children to ideal surroundings specially created. To preserve the home, however humble, to render domestic conditions tolerable, to inculcate better principles in the parents, so that their children might grow up under healthier conditions—this was a policy as rational as it was rare among philanthropic organisations. To preserve the home is to work with nature and with nature's laws. Model institutions, however well-equipped, can never be a substitute for the home. In the home only can domestic habits be formed, domestic duties enforced and practised.

This is the fundamental idea upon which the Society laid the foundation of its great work. That Parliament and the nation as a whole accepted the policy was in

a large measure due to its originator, Mr Waugh. He disarmed prejudice by his enthusiasm, his common-sense, and his command of facts; he exposed the fallacies of honest critics and the attacks of those whose vested interests were at stake with the force of irresistible logic, dauntless irony, and a masterly power of epigram. He succeeded in a few years in gaining from Parliament the 'Children's Charter,' in principle probably the most revolutionary measure of social reform ever placed upon the statute-book of England.

Down to 1889 the parent or guardian of any child might grossly abuse his rights and not come within reach of the arm of the law. The child, as we have already pointed out, was incapable of invoking such law as existed; and those willing to help were hampered by the inadequacy of the Poor Law Amendment Act (1868) and the Offences Against the Person Act (1861). By the Act of 1889 cruelty and neglect were made offences; a child's evidence could be taken without the absurd restriction as to understanding the nature of an oath; and powers were given to remove children to a place of safety by warrant, or to remove them altogether out of the custody of those who brutally ill-treated or neglected them. In 1894 a consolidating Act was passed, of wider scope and more extended powers, to mitigate the domestic and other wrongs under which children suffered.

But these Acts would be powerless without the force of public opinion behind them. Thanks to the National Society, local organisations to enforce the Acts were established throughout the land; and a widespread sentiment was created which made them generally effective. Never were Acts of Parliament more justified by results; and never was a social policy more fully vindicated than that of the society. The last annual report of the N.S.P.C.C. shows that 44,255 cases of cruelty, involving the welfare of 124,598 children, were investigated in the year 1904. In 42,526 of these action was taken, 2853 cases were brought into court, and 2756 persons were convicted. About 85 per cent. are cases of neglect and starvation, but the remainder include manslaughter, gross ill-treatment, and nameless wrongs. In the sixteen years since the passing of the Act of 1889, the society has dealt with no less than 418,511 cases in the United

Kingdom, involving the welfare of 1,099,735 children. One shrinks from the contemplation of the appalling mass of child-suffering, misery, shame, and degradation which the figures reveal. Some satisfaction can, however, be gleaned from a consideration of these statistics. It is clear that the wrongs done to children no longer remain unknown, or go unprevented or unpunished. The law is now made a terror to evil-doers. The great majority of the cases, 81 per cent., are dealt with by warning, and this is generally found to be sufficient; for only a few are utterly impervious to an appeal to manhood, pity, or common-sense. In cases of the worst form of evil done to children, that coming under the category of moral wrongs, we are assured of a steady decline, the percentage now being only about 1·9. We hope that so terrible a blot upon the manhood of the nation as these cases imply may, before long, be finally stamped out.

Of the many prevalent sources of child-suffering, one is peculiarly nefarious, and it has grown to enormous dimensions in our own day. We refer to the practice commonly known as 'baby-farming.' In the great majority of cases—some 48,000 annually—the primary object in putting a child out to nurse is to hide the mother's shame; but other causes contribute their quota. With such numbers as these a regular business has been created. The extent and ramification of this trade is beyond belief. Cases of neglect ending in death, entailing a coroner's inquest and perhaps a prosecution, occur from time to time and arouse a moment's attention; but they are soon forgotten, and the trade suffers little or nothing by the exposure. The temptation to poor people to engage in it is great; it requires no capital to start a baby-farm; the stock is ready, and a premium is put on every head. To the wicked the business is profitable, for nothing is easier than to do to death a child on whom a substantial sum of money has been paid down. To expose a child to cold and damp, or to give it improper food, is as deadly and efficacious as poisoning, and has the advantage of being practically safe from detection. This is a terrible indictment to bring against a custom which the law sanctions and the public condones; but it is abundantly justified by a mass of incontrovertible evidence.

How best to deal with illegitimate children is as difficult a question for the legislator as it is for the moralist. To smooth the path of the transgressors and make it easy for them to get rid of the fruits of their sin is simply to corrupt public morals. To restrict unduly the out-nursing of children leads to infanticide or to the suicide of the mother. Brutal as it may seem, the women who, in a moment of frenzy and despair, face to face with life-long misery and shame, lay violent hands on their children are merciful compared to the callous wretches who, by the use of patent foods, biscuits, and syrups, poison babes by a lingering process, or by neglect and exposure produce chronic disease or death. It is a perversion of justice when the jury of a criminal court condemns the one, and the jury of a coroner's court condones the crime of the other. The quality of mercy is strained indeed when it turns aside from the tortured child and pardons the child-torturer.

In all matters relating to nursed-out children the duty of the State is clear as regards the child; it is to see that, whatever arrangements are made for it, it shall at least have a chance of healthy life. Down to 1871 no restrictions were placed on the baby-farming traffic. But the frequent murders of children so stirred the public mind that a committee was appointed 'to inquire as to the best means of preventing the destruction of the lives of infants put out to nurse for hire by their parents.' The cases of Margaret Waters and Mary Hall revealed a scandalous state of affairs existing between the lying-in homes and the baby-farmers of London. Sums totally insufficient were paid for the support of the children given out to the traders. Hand-nursed children have a greater mortality than those nursed under natural conditions; little chance, then, have children when the conditions are abnormally bad, and are deliberately created by a cold calculating instinct and a greedy thirst for gain. The committee pointed out that 'improper and insufficient food, opiates, drugs, crowded rooms, bad air, want of cleanliness, and wilful neglect are sure to be followed in a few months by diarrhoea, convulsions, and wasting away.'

This report led to the passing of the Infant Life Protection Act in 1872. But it was a most inadequate measure. It provided that nurses who received payment

for more than one child under twelve months old should be registered. But little action was taken to enforce even this limited provision. The age limit was much too low; for as much care and attention should be given to a child immediately over one year as under it. The Act did not attempt to deal with the evil as a whole, for the majority of children farmed out are taken singly; and cruelty and neglect leading to death can be practised on one at a time. So inoperative was the Act that in Ireland no proceedings were taken under it for twenty-two years. Then, at last, the Society put it in force. It was shown, in a case that came under its notice, that nineteen children had died under the charge of one woman. These children were secretly done to death; yet in the end nothing worse than a technical breach of the law could be proved against this wicked woman, who escaped with a 5*l.* fine. The Act has been amended by that of 1897, by which the age is raised to five years; and powers are given to local authorities to appoint inspectors to see to the welfare of nursed-out children in registered homes. But the law still falls short of what is required; for it is generally inoperative unless more than one child is taken to be nursed for hire; though it applies in regard to single children for whom one payment of not more than 20*l.* is made. With this exception, no local supervision or registration can be enforced; and the worst evils may continue as before.

Another important question in this connexion is that of infant life-insurance. On it controversy has long raged, but Parliament has hitherto refused to legislate. This omission cannot be traced to want of information, for there are several parliamentary reports upon the subject. The principle laid down by the statute 14 Geo. III regarding life-insurance was sound; under this Act no insurance could be made by any person on any life in which the person for whose benefit the insurance was made had no interest; and children who were not wage-earners could not be insured. By the Friendly Societies Act of 1875 this principle was abandoned, for it allowed the children of the working classes to be insured. It thus created a pecuniary interest in the child's death; and burial-clubs and infant life-insurance became general in the industrial centres throughout the land. We recognise

the general soundness of domestic life in the British working-man's home ; we admit that, as a rule, the happiness of the children is as much an object of consideration in such homes as in those of the higher ranks in life. But the contention that to legislate now on infant life-insurance is class legislation is to forget that the Act which created it was distinctly such. Why should the children of the working-man, especially those of the poorer class, or the thriftless idle class, be subjected to dangers from which the children of the well-to-do are free? If, in the eye of the law, all citizens are equal, this should especially be the case with children. As we have already pointed out, the State should be especially zealous about its children ; and their danger is imminent when they are at the mercy of the callous, brutal, or indifferent, who have a monetary interest in their ceasing to live.

Infant life-insurance is open to the crushing objection that the person who determines whether the child is to live or die, by giving it or not giving it proper food, care, and attention, will profit by its death. It is entirely indefensible that the lives of helpless infant children should be jeopardised for the sake of a paltry pecuniary gain. It has been contended by those who have vested interests in child life-insurance that the practice does not conduce to the death, the neglect, or the ill-treatment of children. The evidence of cases brought into court gives the lie direct to such a contention. It is a startling and suggestive fact that, in the sixteen years of the National Society's work, 265,906 children, or 25 per cent. of those dealt with, were insured for a total sum of 1,383,021*l*. Many judges, magistrates, coroners, medical officers of health, and other officials, have again and again condemned the practice of infant life-insurance, as inciting men and women to the neglect, ill-treatment, and murder of children. The cases arising out of it, and published in the 'Child's Guardian' and other publications by Mr Waugh, are horrible to read, and more than justify Mr Justice Day's condemnation of the system in the words, 'Those pests of society, those deadly societies which insure children, which seemed to be instituted for the destruction of children, for the perpetration of murder.'

Grave indeed must be the danger to children, and painful the experience, to have drawn from a judge in

open assize court so weighty an indictment of a system established by the law of the land. Many journals have also spoken with no uncertain sound about the crimes committed on children by inhuman parents and others, who traffic in their lives for a burial fee. The weight of evidence of the best experience in the land is sufficient to carry reform in this matter; but vested interests and the cant about 'libelling the British working-man' block the way. The system is the last stronghold of the many vested interests which long subjected children to death, suffering, and shame. It is to be hoped that the increasing force of enlightened public opinion may soon sweep it away along with the rest. The insurance of a child's life may arise from the honest desire of well-disposed parents to make provision against a possible visitation of death, or it may arise from the deliberate intention of an unnatural and criminal parent to kill a child for the sake of the insurance policy. With a system capable of such abuse there can be no compromise.

The system of infant life-insurance has been defended on the ground of thrift; it is asserted that it saves the rates from having to bear the cost of many child-burials. Thrift consists in right saving and good management; there is no principle of speculation in it. Now in infant life-insurance there is no return unless the child dies. It has all the elements of a swindling, gambling transaction, in that the speculator can fraudulently secure a share of the stakes. In all other forms of insurance the companies take good care to be protected against bad investors and dishonest speculators. But as for the children of people living under the worst possible conditions, children who are sickly or dying, children who are illegitimate and whose death would be a relief, children who are farmed out—on the lives of such children, one and all, policies can be taken out without question or fear of refusal. The consequence is that a large proportion of premiums are paid in cases of children who die from preventible diseases. The societies would collapse at once were it not, in the first place, for the pence of those subscribers who treat their children well, and, in the second place, the sums accruing from lapsed policies. Never was there a greater abuse of terms than to describe such a system by the name of 'thrift.'

Well indeed did 'Punch' long ago satirise this so-called 'thrift' in lines from which we take the following:—

"Thrift, thrift!" Oh, convenient Death!
Wise counsel he whispereth under his breath
Into pitiful poverty's ear!
Poverty makes even parentage keen
At catching his sinister hints. . . .
"Thrift, thrift!" It is surely the last subtle shift
Of the Spectre to pose as a preacher of Thrift!"

In calling for the abolition of a system which is a menace to child-life, we are convinced that it does not pass the wit of man to establish a general principle, applicable to all working-men's burial-clubs, which would place them above reproach and above suspicion. We recognise the good intentions of the Legislature, which aimed at lightening the burden of the poor, especially in towns where the cost of burial is high; we sympathise with those parents who are anxious to preserve their children from a pauper's grave. Respect for the dead has in all ages, and among all nations, been one of the most profound of human instincts. But infant life-insurance does not stimulate this instinct; it trades on it and degrades it. The local authorities might surely devise some means of burial which would meet the natural desire of the self-respecting poor who shrink from the ignominy of a pauper's grave. Let the burial fee go to the undertaker, and not a single penny of the insurance money to those who have the care of the child.

We have now discussed the chief causes of child-suffering and the various legislative measures passed to remedy them. No greater service to the cause of social reform has been done in the Victorian era than in this one department. Numerous have been the means adopted for the relief of suffering children in the hospitals and homes established throughout the length and breadth of the land. The strides that have been taken in the matter of education in the last half-century have been immense; and, if the greatness of a nation may in one sense be measured by the happiness of its children, the measures taken during the reign of Queen Victoria have done much to ensure that greatness. But, as we have

shown, and the daily records of the National Society continue to show, a vast mass of cruelty, suffering, and neglect still remains, and is bound to remain, under our present social conditions. Nothing but a sound state policy for children, and the further extension of a sound public opinion to enforce that policy, can mitigate the evils or check their increase.

A state department for children, as we have already indicated, which would keep in touch with and direct the various organisations now at work on their behalf, is a pressing necessity. The field covered by the National Society alone is so vast that this voluntary organisation finds the burden of support more than it can bear. Philanthropic work is best done when done voluntarily; but in enforcing the many Acts of Parliament dealing with children, in the efforts to obtain the passing of new statutes and the amendment of old, and in the many matters concerning the control and disposal of children, the help of the State, either through a special department or a branch of the Home Office, is sorely needed. The Society is not only doing the work of the State, but it is taxed by the State in doing it. The responsibility which the Society takes upon itself in carrying out the law under royal charter is immense; it should not be left to bear the whole weight of that responsibility. It is time that the nation should follow the example of some of our colonies and some of the American states, and institute a state department for children; it should extend the principle of dealing with all matters touching their welfare through the supervision and subvention of voluntary agencies, as it has already done with industrial and reformatory schools.

Art. III.—GEOFFREY OF MONMOUTH AND THE LEGEND OF ARTHUR.

1. *The British History, translated into English from the Latin, of Jeffrey of Monmouth, with a large preface.* By Aaron Thompson. London: Bowyer, 1718.
2. *Galfredi Monumetensis Historia Britonum.* Edidit J. A. Giles. London: Nutt, 1844.
3. *Gottfrieds von Monmouth Historia Regum Britannie.* Herausgegeben von San-Marte (A. Schulz). Halle, 1854.
4. *Six Old English Chronicles.* Edited, with illustrative notes, by J. A. Giles. New edition. London: Bell, 1891.
5. *Geoffrey of Monmouth.* Translated by Sebastian Evans, LL.D. London: Dent, 1903.
6. *Studies in the Arthurian Legend.* By John Rhys, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891.

AMONG the literary celebrities who find a place in the great hall of Chaucer's 'House of Fame,' Geoffrey of Monmouth holds a station of equal dignity with Homer. Both stand on iron pillars, and both are 'besy for to bere up Troye.' The distinction thus bestowed upon 'English Gaufride' loses something of its glamour when we discover that it is shared by persons of such very doubtful credentials as Dares and Dictys and Guido de Colonna. Dares the Phrygian and Dictys the Cretan have long been known to be plausible pseudonyms, covering two rival accounts of the siege of Troy; while Guido is an unblushing plagiarist from Benoit de Sainte More. Geoffrey may well be held to have more in common with the plagiarists and the forgers than with Homer; but such nice questions of literary authenticity did not greatly trouble Chaucer. He does, indeed, hint that all the presenters of the tale of Troy do not command equally implicit confidence, for 'betwix hem was a litel envye,' and some currency had been given to the insinuation that even the great Homer 'made lyes.' But Geoffrey, for all Chaucer knows or cares, is as reputable an author as any in his Trojan gallery; he is even good enough to have precedence over Virgil, whose meaner 'pillar' is but of 'tinned yren clere.' This preference appears somewhat unfair to Virgil, when we remember that Geoffrey was the most audacious of the medieval manipu-

lators of the legend, originally suggested by the 'Æneid,' of the Trojan ancestry of the British race. Chaucer, however, took Geoffrey for an Englishman; and the dearth in his day of native literary claimants to the high places of the temple of fame may account in some degree for his assigning an iron pedestal to the chronicler of the kings of Britain.

Geoffrey's title to enduring renown rests, as it happens, on far other grounds than his slender connexion with the tale of Troy. He owes his place in the 'House of Fame' to Chaucer's own predilection for the legends of Troy, which formed a part of 'the matter of Rome the great,' as against the newer 'matter of Britain.' The author of 'Troilus and Criseyde' and of 'al the love of Palamon and Arcyte' found little to attract him in ancient British fable or in the later developments of Arthurian romance. 'The Wife of Bath's Tale' has, indeed, an adventitious setting in the court of King Arthur; but Chaucer's true sentiments about romance are reflected in his burlesque 'Tale of Sir Thopas.'

It is, however, just what Chaucer ignored or despised in his British 'History' that now constitutes Geoffrey's chief claim to literary consideration. His elaborate genealogy of what Milton, in his 'History of Britain,' called 'the Brute Kings of this island' has long since been consigned to the limbo of historical curiosities. But his deposition from the ranks of trustworthy historians has only served to enhance his distinction and his privilege as a purveyor and inspirer of romance. For some four centuries after his death, his 'History' served as a quarry for sober historians and romantic poets alike. Although William of Newbury* and Giraldus Cambrensis†

* William roundly denounces Geoffrey as a 'saucy and shameless liar.' ('Historia Rerum Anglicarum,' Proemium.)

† Gerald, in his 'Itinerarium Cambriæ,' tells of a certain Welshman at Caerleon, named Melerius, who, 'having always an extraordinary familiarity with evil spirits, by seeing them, knowing them, talking with them, and calling each by his proper name, was enabled through their assistance to foretell future events. . . . He knew when any one spoke falsely in his presence, for he saw the devil, as it were, leaping and exulting on the tongue of the liar. . . . If the evil spirits oppressed him too much, the Gospel of St John was placed on his bosom, when, like birds, they immediately vanished; but when the book was removed, and the "History of the Britons," by Geoffrey Arthur, was substituted in its place, they instantly reappeared in greater numbers, and remained a longer time than usual on his body and on the book.'

had, even before the twelfth century was out, sought to discredit him, confidence in Geoffrey's 'History' was not generally shaken until the scholars and antiquaries of the sixteenth century, headed by Camden, trained their guns upon him. Yet this was the very period of his greatest vogue and popularity with the higher order of poets. Sackville and Spenser, Drayton and Warner, caring little for his credibility as an historian—although Drayton, indeed, is at some pains to defend him*—accept his fables in the spirit with which, we may conceive, they were offered. Geoffrey came to his own when, rejected by critical historians, he was adopted by the poets of England's greatest romantic age.

The Elizabethan age was, in more ways than one, an epoch eminently favourable to the resuscitation of interest in such a book as Geoffrey's. Not only had Malory's monumental compilation—the popularity of which is attested by Ascham, who knew 'when God's Bible was banished the Court and "Morte Arthure" received into the Prince's chamber'—served to invest Arthurian romance with a literary grace and dignity hitherto unapproached in English; the heightened patriotic sentiment of the time gave to native British legends a charm and a significance such as they had never possessed before. Moreover, a Tudor dynasty held the throne; and Spenser was not alone in reminding Elizabeth that she could boast of a genuine 'British' pedigree.

'Thy name, O sovaine Queene! thy realme, and race,
From this renowned Prince derived arre,
Who mightily upheld that royall mace
Which now thou bear'st, to thee descended farre
From mighty kings and conquerours in warre,
Thy fathers and great Grandfathers of old,
Whose noble deeds above the Northern starre
Immortall fame for ever hath enrold;
As in that old man's booke they were in order told.'

Geoffrey, as the dedications of his 'History' and of his 'Prophecies of Merlin' sufficiently prove, was himself

* 'That Geoffrey Monmouth, first, our Brutus did devise,
Not heard of till his time, our adversary says;
When pregnantly we prove, ere that historian's days,
A thousand ling'ring years, our prophets clearly sung
The Britain-founding Brute,' etc. ('Polyolbion,' Song x.)

not unskilled in courtly flattery, and could have wished for no higher compliment to his book than to have it thus cited as a great poet's warrant for 'blazoning' the name of a British queen.

One noteworthy result of the accession of the Tudors was to make Wales conscious for the first time that it had an hereditary interest in the English crown, strengthened as it was by the parliamentary union which, in the glowing words of Burke, caused 'the day-star of the English constitution to arise' in Welsh hearts. It was under the Tudors that the name Britain began to have a political meaning, a century before official sanction was given to it in the proclamation of James I as 'King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland.' At such a time it was but natural that imaginative writers of all kinds should turn to 'British' stories as the common inheritance both of the English race and of the lineal descendants of the ancient Britons. Literature, no less than legislation and royal favour, could help in bringing about a fusion of the nations. Be the causes, however, what they may, these 'wan legends' of the British prime exerted a potent influence over the poets of the Elizabethan era. Even Shakespeare fell under their fascination. It is in Geoffrey's fabulous chronicle that we find the first rude outlines of the main plot of his most terrible tragedy. There also, but very faintly sketched, appears for the first time the titular character of one of the most delectable of his romances. No rearrangement of pedestals or niches in the 'House of Fame' can altogether dislodge one who suggested to our greatest dramatist, even if only through the medium of Holinshed, the stories of 'Cymbeline' and 'Lear.'

It is significant that Shakespeare, in company with the other leading playwrights of his time, should have left the story of Arthur severely alone.* But, when we come to analyse the constituent elements of the Arthurian legend as it presented itself to the Elizabethans, its rejection by the dramatists is not difficult to explain.

* The only considerable Elizabethan plays based upon Geoffrey's British matter are 'The Misfortunes of Arthur,' by Thomas Hughes (1587), and the first printed English tragedy, 'Gorboduc, or Ferrex and Porrex,' by Sackville and Norton (1565)—both tragedies after the Senecan pattern—and the pseudo-Shakespearean 'Locrine' and 'The Birth of Merlin.'

Geoffrey's earlier British legends came down to them in a fairly uncontaminated form; but around the figure of Arthur there clung so vast a mass of alien and fantastic accretions as to make him almost unrecognisable as a national British hero. Malory, though preserving the traditional legends of his British birth and retaining, in the main, the British topography of primitive versions of the story, presents Arthur as a character and in a *milieu* which are anything but British. In the 'Morte d'Arthur,' as in the later medieval romances generally, the British prince and his knights move about in a featureless land 'of dreams that wave before the half-shut eye,' citizens of no determinate realm, surrounded by all the phantasmagoria of fairy-lore, of chivalry, of ecclesiastical symbolism, of Oriental magic. Even Geoffrey, in his ambition to make of him another Charlemagne by including continental conquests among his exploits, cannot be acquitted of the charge of having abetted the denationalisation of Arthur.

The playwright, intent above everything upon realistic effect, must have been bewildered by the enormous accumulation of fanciful ornament and far-fetched lore with which Arthurian romance had come to be loaded during its progress through the Middle Ages. Exploited for the uses of a cosmopolitan culture, the characters and incidents of Arthurian story had become too fantastic and remote for vivid dramatic presentment. Not indeed that all the branches of the later composite legend can be said to be altogether destitute of dramatic possibilities. The bare story of Lancelot and Guinevere had in it the elements of a tragedy that might well have challenged the highest powers of a Shakespeare, while the genius of a Wagner has proved to a later age the poignant dramatic interest of the tragic love of Tristram and Iseult. But the fact remains that no English drama of the first order has been built upon any Arthurian theme.

Nor has Arthurian story inspired a great epic. Blackmore, the 'City Bard or Knight Physician,' as Dryden calls him, had the rashness to attempt what Dryden himself had planned and Milton had dreamt of. As to Blackmore's two epics, 'Prince Arthur' (1695) and 'King Arthur' (1697), posterity has generally acquiesced in Dryden's pious aspiration, 'Peace be to the *Manes* of his Arthurs.'

There is no great Arthurian epic any more than there is a great Arthurian drama, and for the same reason. Epic and drama alike demand clear, well-defined themes, and characters sufficiently actual and life-like to appeal to 'the businesses and bosoms' of men and women who act and think and feel. Romance is essentially the product of dreamland; and its heroes, however much they may charm us in our moments of ecstasy or indolent reverie, are felt to have no concern with what affects the will or effectually stirs the heart. Arthur, more than any other medieval hero, is the constitutional sovereign of the fairest realm of romance, the king of fairyland by the universal acclaim of the host of its enfranchised literary citizens. He is thus outside the pale of moving epic and stirring drama.

Mr Swinburne would indeed put the entire series of British legends out of court on the strength of a somewhat similar argument. In the dedication to his tragedy of 'Lochrine' he writes:—

'No part have these wan legends in the sun
Whose glory lightens Greece and gleams on Rome.
Their elders live; but these—their day is done!'

Such, however, was not the opinion of more than one of the greater poets of the past. Patriotic motives induced both Milton and Dryden to toy with the design of an Arthurian epic. But Milton, although haunted by Arthurian memories to the last, soon felt the unreality of a task in which it were

'chief mastery to dissect
With long and tedious havoc fabl'd knights
In battles feign'd';

and, had Dryden ever seriously essayed to write an *Arthuriad* 'for the honour of his native country,' he would almost certainly have found more cogent reasons for abandoning the work than those which actually discouraged him from the attempt.* Tennyson alone of modern poets, seems to have accurately gauged the

* In his 'Discourse on Satire' Dryden tells us that what prevented him from even beginning his projected epic was 'being encouraged only with fair words by King Charles II, my little salary ill paid, and no prospect of a future subsistence.'

poetical possibilities of the Arthurian matter. By presenting the chief incidents and characters of the legend in a series of idylls strung along a slender thread of allegoric meaning, he has infused into them as much dramatic interest as perhaps they were capable of containing. At any rate his experiment has its justification in the history of the legend's development during the ages of chivalry; for the peculiarity of the Arthurian, as distinguished from the other romantic cycles, is that the circumstances of its growth inevitably tended to give to many of its primary features a symbolic significance.

The popularity of Arthurian romance dates from a time which marks a momentous change in literary tastes and fashions. The twelfth century is to the student of imaginative literature a period only less rich in interest than the age of the great Italian Renaissance. It was an epoch of immense literary activity and, above all, of adventurous enterprise in the cultivation of new literary forms and the exploitation of new themes. It was the twelfth rather than the fifteenth century that witnessed, for literature at least, the break with the long tyranny of an effete Latin culture and the birth of 'the modern spirit.' It was the age of the Crusades, which brought together from every part of western Europe men who, till then, had never ventured beyond the limits of their own tribal domains. Contact with each other and with foreign life quickened their imagination and sharpened their wit. The folk-tales of every European country began to circulate far and wide, to form in time an international stock of lively *fabliaux*. From the East came strange tales of magic and princely splendour, while the lore of Arabia, of Byzantium, and of Alexandria, helped to swell the literary capital of monkish scribes. It was indeed the very seed-time of romance; and out of the soil first watered by the recital of the deeds of Alexander and of Charlemagne there grew a prolific crop of legends and marvellous *gestes*. The fruits were garnered by the romantic schools of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, composed of men who knew their business as well as any modern literary coterie bent upon a common aim. But of all the romantic growth of the time, the most characteristically *bizarre* product was the Arthurian legend, with its heterogeneous elements of

Celtic myth and fable, of magic and wizardry, of strange quests and hair-breadth adventures, of light loves and of saintly devotion to celibate ideals.

Long before the rise of any romantic school, there floated about among the Celtic races of the West vague traditions about Arthur. The written records of his deeds appear to have been scanty, but his name was kept well before the popular imagination in folklore, in triads, and in sundry snatches of poetry. It was when Norman culture came into contact with the Celtic genius that the idea took shape of creating a romantic 'matter of Britain,' as attractive and as imposing as the better known matters 'of France' and 'of Rome.' No better account has been given of the causes of the sudden efflorescence of Arthurian romance in the latter half of the twelfth century, and of Geoffrey's relation to it, than that of Gibbon.

'The pride and curiosity of the Norman conquerors prompted them to enquire into the ancient history of Britain: they listened with fond credulity to the tale of Arthur, and eagerly applauded the merit of a prince who had triumphed over the Saxons, their common enemies. His romance, transcribed in the Latin of Jeffrey of Monmouth, and afterwards translated into the fashionable idiom of the times, was enriched with the various, though incoherent, ornaments which were familiar to the experience, the learning, or the fancy, of the twelfth century. The progress of a Phrygian colony, from the Tiber to the Thames, was easily engrafted on the fable of the *Æneid*; and the royal ancestors of Arthur derived their origin from Troy, and claimed their alliance with the Cæsars. His trophies were decorated with captive provinces and Imperial titles; and his Danish victories avenged the recent injuries of his country. The gallantry and superstition of the British hero, his feasts and tournaments, and the memorable institution of his Knights of the Round Table, were faithfully copied from the reigning manners of chivalry; and the fabulous exploits of Uther's son appear less incredible than the adventures which were achieved by the enterprising valour of the Normans. Pilgrimage and the holy wars introduced into Europe the specious miracles of Arabian magic. Fairies and giants, flying dragons and enchanted palaces, were blended with the more simple fictions of the West; and the fate of Britain depended on the art, or the predictions, of Merlin. Every nation embraced and adorned the popular romance of Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table; their

names were celebrated in Greece and Italy; and the voluminous tales of Sir Lancelot and Sir Tristram were devoutly studied by the princes and nobles, who disregarded the genuine heroes and historians of antiquity.*

Gibbon, as this passage shows, regarded Geoffrey as primarily a romancer; at least, he saw that his contribution to Arthurian romance dwarfed everything in his Chronicle that might have any claim to rank as authentic history. Not only has this opinion been confirmed by subsequent research; it is the only opinion possible when Geoffrey's 'History' is read in the light of the general literary history of his time. He is the first writer to perceive the romantic value of the Arthurian stories, of their possibilities as matter of literary entertainment. It is impossible to read the later portions of his Chronicle without feeling that Geoffrey, once he had embarked upon the history of Merlin and of Arthur, was fully conscious of having lit upon a genuine *trouvaille*. Being an accomplished rhetorician, he responded to the demands of the hour with an address which would have done credit to the most alert of modern journalists, and produced a chronicle which breathes all the careless charm of a novel. There is even some slight ground for supposing that his original design was to weave his British legends into a romantic poem in Latin hexameters, and that fragments of this projected poem are imbedded in the text of his first book.*

Such an assumption, however, is not required to convince us that Geoffrey's 'History,' as it stands, is in spirit and motive much nearer akin to the metrical romances than to the compilations of any prose chronicler. His adoption of the chronicle form has indeed been a curious snare to many of his imitators and critics alike. A little imagination might have suggested to them that, in an age of literary experiment, an adventurous scribe might well conceive the idea of using that time-honoured literary form for an excursion in fiction. That Geoffrey did conceive something of the kind is apparent from the

* Dr Sebastian Evans advances this opinion with some confidence in the epilogue to his translation of the 'History,' p. 361. It is worth noting that a poem in hexameter verse, the 'Vita Merlini,' is on the best authority assigned to Geoffrey.

tone of his epilogue, where he bids reputable historians like William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon 'be silent as to the Kings of the Britons, since they have not that book in the British speech which Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, did convey hither out of Brittany.' In other words, he tells orthodox chroniclers to mind their own business, and not to pry into the romantic enclosure of which he alone has the key.

Geoffrey's distinction, therefore, in literary history is that he is the first to guide the stream of Arthurian fable into the main channels of European literature. He gave Arthur his passport to the commonwealth of letters, and seeking, after the manner of other romantic scribes, for a stamp of authenticity, he found his certificate in the real or alleged 'British book' given him by the Archdeacon of Oxford. The fully-developed legend became, as we have seen, something very different from what it is in Geoffrey's hands. But, before the appearance of the 'History,' Arthur, as a literary hero, is virtually unknown. Afterwards everything is changed. Arthur becomes the centre of the most splendid of the romantic cycles. His knights multiply; he founds the Round Table; his court becomes the rendezvous of peers whose parts and prowess all but overshadow his own. Some of Geoffrey's detractors attempt to minimise his influence upon Arthurian romance by pointing out that he knows nothing of some of the most striking incidents and characters of the full-grown legend; that he is altogether silent about Lancelot, about Tristram, about the Holy Grail. But to have made a beginning is, in such a matter, more than half the whole. Geoffrey it is who gives us our first full-length literary portrait of King Arthur; and that alone establishes his claim to a place in the front rank of romantic writers. So intimately indeed did his name become bound up with the fame of Arthur in the generation after his death that William of Newbury states that he had the by-name of 'Arturus,' because he had 'cloaked fables about Arthur with the honest name of history.*' The

* 'Hist. Rer. Anglicarum,' Proemium. Geoffrey was known to his contemporaries, Henry of Huntingdon and Robert of Torigny—who are both referred to on a later page—as 'Geoffrey Arthur'; and Dr Sebastian Evans, rejecting the theory that 'Arthur' was a patronymic, somewhat fancifully maintains, on the strength of an entry in the foundation charter

question of Geoffrey's honesty largely depends upon the temper and the sense of humour of those who seek to determine it. For ourselves we prefer to take his *Chronicle* as a more or less deliberate work of fiction, and therefore as a contribution of the first importance to romantic literature.

Of Geoffrey's personal history we know almost as little as of the mysterious 'British book' upon which he professes to found his romantic *Chronicle*. He was almost certainly of Welsh birth.* He was, as the 'History' indicates, a friend of Walter, known as Walter Calenius,† Archdeacon of Oxford, and his name follows that of Walter in the list of witnesses to the foundation charter of the abbey of Osney, near Oxford, in 1129.‡ His life seems to have been quite uneventful and to have presented no opportunities of any notable public activity until its (apparently untimely) close. We have authentic record of his ordination as priest, and of his consecration as Bishop of St Asaph—both in the month of February 1152. He was a sufficiently important personage to appear as a witness to the compact made in November 1153 between King Stephen and his successor, Henry. He died at Llandaff in 1155.

The date of the composition of his 'History' is a matter of some controversy. It is certain that it must have been complete in the form now known to us by 1148 at the latest, but it is equally certain that it existed in some form as early as 1139. A letter from Henry of Huntingdon, prefixed to the *Chronicle* of Robert of

of the abbey of Osney, that, 'as early as 1139, Geoffrey had already set hand to a work of which Arthur was, or was to be, the hero.' Even though the evidence of certain Welsh documents that his father's name was Arthur be rejected as untrustworthy, it is hard to believe that he could, as early as 1129, or even 1139, when Henry of Huntingdon saw a copy of his 'History,' have signed himself 'Geoffrey Arthur' in the confident expectation of a literary immortality to be derived from his glorification of Arthur's deeds.

* The evidence of Welsh documents on the point is not conclusive; but his acquaintance with Welsh place-names and with Welsh traditions goes far to prove that he was a Welshman. He is called 'of Monmouth' probably because he was educated at the Benedictine monastery of that place. He is often wrongly styled 'Archdeacon of Monmouth.' There never was an archdeaconry of Monmouth.

† Walter Calenius has often been confounded with Walter Map, who became Archdeacon of Oxford in 1197.

‡ His name appears here as 'Geoffrey Arthur.' Cf. next par.

Torigny,* gives a short abstract of 'a big book' (*liber grandis*) by one 'Geoffrey Arthur,' which he, Henry, found in the year 1139 at the abbey of Bec in Normandy. Henry had long been anxious to discover some authentic account of the kings who reigned in this island 'betwixt Brutus and the days of Julius,' but although he had

'many a time and oft made inquiry as to those ages, yet never had he found any one who could tell him, nor any book wherein was written aught about them. Howbeit' (he continues), 'in this very year, which is the eleven hundred and thirty-ninth from the Incarnation of our Lord, when I was journeying to Rome with Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, at Bec, where the said Archbishop had formerly been Abbot, to my amazement I found the written record of these events.'

The occasion and the motive of the composition of the 'History' form the subject of some ingenious and not altogether improbable conjectures by Dr Sebastian Evans in his recently published translation. The least tenable of Dr Evans's speculations seems to us to be his explanation of Geoffrey's dedications of the book as so many deliberate bids for ecclesiastical preferment. He even suspects that Geoffrey had at one time been haunted by 'archiepiscopal visions,' for in no other way can he account for the 'dithyrambic eulogy of the City of Legions, Caerleon-upon-Usk,' in the ninth book of the 'History.'† The course of events had altogether shattered these dreams long before 1148; 'but if the archbishopric *in posse*,' continues Dr Evans, 'had disappeared, there were still English and Welsh bishoprics *in esse* not altogether hopelessly beyond Geoffrey's reach. Here was Bishop Alexander of Lincoln just dead; why should not Geoffrey succeed him?' He would at least call the attention of the two 'pillars of the realm' to

* The letter is addressed to one Warinus, otherwise unknown, and is published in the 'Chronicles of Stephen' (Rolls Series), iv, 65.

† Caerleon is called by Geoffrey 'the third metropolitan see of Britain.' Whatever Geoffrey's own ambitions may have been, there certainly were Welshmen in the twelfth century—Giraldus Cambrensis for one—who cherished the dream of establishing a metropolitan see in Wales. It was, however, to be, not at Caerleon, but at St David's, in fulfilment of a prophecy of Merlin, 'Menevia pallio urbis Legionum induetur' (see Geoffrey, vii, 3).

his claims. So, accepting the unique dedication of the Bern ms. as genuine, Dr Evans maintains that Geoffrey

'took his courage and his book into both hands and dedicated the new edition with his left hand to King Stephen and with his right to Robert of Gloucester, appending a *post-mortem* dedication to the newly incorporated "Prophecies of Merlin" to Bishop Alexander by way of a hint that the writer of the prophecies would be an excellent and useful successor to the see of Lincoln.'

The princely see of Lincoln, one would think, was too splendid a prize in those days for a mere literary cleric to aspire to; but that Geoffrey's literary venture was not unconnected with hopes of ecclesiastical promotion is highly probable. At least we know of no better claim to his actual reward, the bishopric of St Asaph.

Of greater interest to the literary student is Dr Evans's surmise that Geoffrey's 'History' was written as a 'national epos,' intended to celebrate the united glories of the composite Norman kingdom which attained its widest extent under Henry II. Geoffrey was, on this supposition, originally inspired by Henry Beauclerc, who, more than any other prince of his line, sought to enlist the services of men of learning and of letters in the cause of Norman civilisation. Hence, to compare small things with great, Henry played Augustus to Geoffrey's Virgil. Geoffrey was to write a national prose epic in which Norman and Englishman, Breton and Welshman, could take common pride. The essential homogeneity of the new Norman 'empire' was to be shown by an account of the descent of its constituent races from a branch of that Trojan stock which had laid the foundations of the greatness of Imperial Rome. Brutus, whose eponymous connexion with the country had already been suggested by Nennius, was to be for Britain what Æneas was for Rome. Hence in time all records of the early British kings, whether in prose or verse, which had this mythic starting-point came to be called 'Bruts'—presumably in imitation of the title of Virgil's epic.

Geoffrey's Chronicle therefore is the first 'Brut,' the first 'inspired' adaptation of the Brutus legend for the glorification of Britain. Dr Evans, however, finds it somewhat difficult to establish any very close analogy

between Geoffrey's 'Brut' and the 'Æneid.' He is constrained to admit that the real hero of Geoffrey's book—the postulate 'traditional hero of the Anglo-Welsh-Norman-Breton nucleus of empire'—was not Brutus but King Arthur, as much 'Geoffrey's creation as Æneas was that of Virgil.' And the assumption that Geoffrey deliberately 'created' his Arthur in the interests of Norman Imperialism is certainly a plausible explanation of his expansion of the British king's continental exploits. For, with Geoffrey, Arthur, although a prince of British birth, is no mere *comes Britanniae*, an insular potentate who

'Drew all their petty principdoms under him,
Their king and head, and made a realm, and reign'd.'

His name resounds through every part of Europe, and the hosts of the Roman Empire itself are no match for his victorious arms.

The weakness of this theory of an Anglo-Norman 'epos' lies in the difficulty of reconciling it, not so much with the Arthurian part of the 'History' as with the scope and character of the work as a whole. For the Arthurian chapters—albeit the most remarkable feature in the book—form but a comparatively small section of the entire 'History.' The book is a 'History of the Kings of Britain,' and ostensibly represents the ambition of a writer of British birth to glorify the native traditions of his race. The Brutus legend is borrowed as affording at once the most plausible and the most illustrious account of the origin of the British kings and of the ancient name of Britain. Then follow, in a long series, the histories of the kings from Brutus to Cadwaladr. Strange tales and wonders are interwoven with what purports to be a precise and ordered record of actual events; many famous place-names on the early map of Britain are ingeniously related to some fabulous incident or to some dim traditional hero. Through six books the narrative proceeds, strictly confined to the insular history of Britain and its rulers, until, in the seventh book, we suddenly come upon the 'Prophecies of Merlin.'

Geoffrey is now in the very heart of 'the enchanted ground,' as remote from the haunts of the pedestrian chronicler as he could well be. Here, at last, comes his

opportunity for romantic expansion. Merlin's magic arts are made largely contributory to the birth of 'the most renowned Arthur, who was not only famous in after years, but was well worthy of all the fame he did achieve by his surpassing prowess.' The ninth and tenth books are entirely taken up with Arthur's exploits; and Geoffrey's concern seems to us to be far less to make of Arthur the international hero desiderated by Dr Evans than to exalt a British prince into a romantic figure, overshadowing even Alexander and Charlemagne, who were already the centres of profitably worked romantic 'cycles.' How well Geoffrey succeeded in this romantic design appears from William of Newbury's pathetic protestation that he had 'made the little finger of his Arthur stouter than the back of Alexander the Great.'

This explanation of the motive of Geoffrey's 'History' derives additional support from the fact that it is all based upon a certain 'most ancient book in the British tongue,' which was most considerately placed at his disposal by Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford. Faithful and matter-of-fact annalists like Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury were, as we have seen, interdicted the use of this book. The history of the 'Kings of the Saxons' could safely be committed to such writers, but the continuation of the story of the kings 'who succeeded in Wales' was beyond the powers of any but a *protégé* and a disciple of Geoffrey himself, Caradoc of Llancarvan. That the reference to the 'British book' is altogether a ruse, deliberately resorted to for the mystification of readers and later writers, we do not believe. Geoffrey doubtless drew upon some documents, possibly Welsh, which have since been lost. He borrowed all he could from Bede and Nennius; but that the 'British book,' if it ever existed, must have been something more than a copy of Nennius is obvious from the fact that Geoffrey expressly states that it was written in 'the British tongue.' The evidence of the best texts (not the printed ones) goes to show that Geoffrey, whatever may have been the extent of his mastery of the Welsh language, had a surprisingly intimate acquaintance with Welsh place-names and with Welsh folklore. One need not, however, claim an exclusively Welsh origin for his matter. Arthurian and other ancient British legends

were common alike to Wales, Cornwall, and Brittany; and the 'British book' might well have served as a convenient label for embroideries culled from every section of the variegated Celtic fringe.

Although the more specifically romantic portions of the 'History' are those which recount the achievements of Arthur, the work throughout reveals the hand of one who felt that he was giving to the world something very different from a bare, matter-of-fact chronicle. Geoffrey's very assumption of an orthodox chronicler's pose, and his imitation of some of the minor practices and devices of authentic historians, only serve to discover, to any attentive reader, the thinness of his disguise. His introductory chapter, for example, with its apologetic note, reads like a calculated attempt, almost worthy of Defoe, to disarm the sceptical reader by vouching an authority, at once ancient and well-accredited, for the strange legends that were to follow and for the ornate manner of their telling. This elaborate prologue is worth quoting in full, as it really strikes the keynote to the style and motive of the whole work.

' Oftentimes in turning over in mine own mind the many themes that might be subject-matter of a book, my thoughts would fall upon the plan of writing a history of the Kings of Britain; and in my musings thereupon meseemed it a marvel that, beyond such mention as Gildas and Bede have made of them in their luminous tractate, naught could I find as concerning the kings that had dwelt in Britain before the Incarnation of Christ, nor naught even as concerning Arthur and the many others that did succeed him after the Incarnation, albeit that their deeds be worthy of praise everlasting and be as pleasantly rehearsed from memory by word of mouth in the traditions of many peoples as though they had been written down. Now, whilst I was thus thinking upon such matters, Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, a man learned not only in the art of eloquence, but in the histories of foreign lands, offered me a certain most ancient book in the British language that did set forth the doings of them all in due succession and order from Brute, the first King of the Britons, onward to Cadwallader, the son of Cadwallo, all told in stories of exceeding beauty. At his request, therefore, albeit that never have I gathered gay flowers of speech in other men's little gardens, and am content with mine own rustic manner of speech and mine own writing-reeds, have I been

at the pains to translate this volume into the Latin tongue. For, had I besprinkled my page with high-flown phrases, I should only have engendered a weariness in my readers by compelling them to spend more time over the meaning of the words than upon understanding the drift of my story.'*

Again, Geoffrey endeavours, especially in the earlier chapters of his book, to give an air of authenticity and circumstantiality to his narrative by gravely recording contemporaneous events in sacred and profane history. The practice was, of course, common enough among ancient chroniclers, Nennius among their number; but Geoffrey resorts to it in a way which suggests deliberate parody. Thus we read that when Gwendolen, after a reign of fifteen years, handed over the sceptre to her son Maddan, 'Samuel the prophet reigned in Judæa, and Silvius Æneas was still living. And Homer was held to be a famous teller of histories and poet.' Leil 'builded a city in the northern parts of Britain called after his name Kaerleil,' what time 'Solomon began to build the temple of the Lord in Jerusalem and the Queen of Sheba came thither to hearken unto his wisdom.' Hudibras founded 'the fortress of Mount Paladur, which is now called Shaftesbury. There, while the wall was a-building, an eagle spake, the sayings whereof'—here we have a flagrant instance of Geoffrey's method of throwing dust in the ingenuous reader's eyes—'had I believed them to be true, I would not have shrunk from committing to written memory along with the rest. At that time reigned Capys, the son of Epitus; and Haggai, Amos, Joel, and Azarias did prophesy.' Once he is well embarked on the full tide of his narrative Geoffrey gradually ceases to give us these chronological data, but he occasionally recollects himself, even when far advanced; he stops to remind us, for example, towards the close of his fourth book, that the city of Gloucester was built about the time that 'Paul the Apostle did found the Church of Antioch, and, coming afterward unto Rome, did there hold the bishopric thereof, sending Mark the Evangelist into Egypt to preach the Gospel he had written.'

A feature of Geoffrey's book, which is well illustrated

* This and other extracts are quoted from Dr Sebastian Evans's excellent translation.

by one of the passages just quoted, is his fondness for ingenious topographical explanations. In some of the earlier Welsh folk-tales—in the older 'Mabinogion,' for example—it is usual to find the story-teller tracing the origin of a familiar place-name to some mythic character or romantic incident. 'He required (says Professor Rhys) the topography to connote story or history.' Geoffrey obeys the same impulse. Thus the fight of Corineus (the original of 'Jack the Giant-killer') with the giant Goëmagot is made to account for the name, still preserved in more than one locality, of 'Gog-Magog's Leap' (Llam-Goëmagot). London, originally called Trinovantum or New Troy by Brutus, was renamed Kaerlud by its second founder, Lud, the brother of Cassibelaunus;* the body of this same Lud was buried 'nigh unto that gate which even yet is called Porthlud in British, but in Saxon Ludgate.' In the city of Trinovantum, Belinus, who, with his brother Brennius, sacked Rome, built 'a gate of marvellous workmanship,' which was called after him Belinesgata, otherwise Billingsgate; and so on. Several of these topographical legends, however, have an interest quite apart from the names they profess to explain; they take us back to an antiquity, of which Geoffrey does not fully possess the secret, and embody traditions which are but flotsam and jetsam cast up in some remote past on 'the shores of old romance.' Such is the story of the

'Virgin daughter of Lochrine
Sprung of old Anchises' line,'

who gave her name to the Severn. This is how Geoffrey tells it, and his is the first version of the story known to literature.

'Years later, after Corineus was dead, Lochrine deserted Gwendolen and raised Estrildis to be Queen. Gwendolen thereupon, being beyond measure indignant, went into Cornwall, and gathering together all the youth of that kingdom, began to harass Lochrine by leading forays into his land. At last, after both had mustered their armies, a battle was fought on the river Stour, and Lochrine, smitten by an arrow, lost his

* Book I, 17, and III, 20. Geoffrey's acquaintance with Welsh place-names at least, if not with the Welsh language, is attested by such forms as *Llamgoëmagot*, *Porthlud*, etc.

life and all the joys thereof. Whereupon Gwendolen laid hold on the helm of state, maddened by the same revengeful fury as her father, insomuch as that she bade Estrildis and Sabrina her daughter be flung into the river that is now called Severn, issuing an edict throughout all Britain that the river should be called by the damsel's name. For she was minded that it should bear her name for ever, for that it was her own husband that begat her; whereby it cometh to pass that even unto this day the river in the British tongue is called Sabren, which by corruption in other speech is called Severn.*

The story of King Lear, again, possesses an intrinsic interest far transcending the association of the king's name with the town of Leicester.* Even Geoffrey's rude presentment of it strikes the note of great tragedy which caught the ear of Shakespeare, and is made to reverberate through the tumultuous strains of his mighty drama. Witness the lament of the British king in his adversity.

'Ye destinies that do pursue your wonted way marked out by irrevocable decree, wherefore was it your will ever to uplift me to happiness so fleeting? For a keener grief it is to call to mind that lost happiness than to suffer the presence of the unhappiness that cometh after. For the memory of the days when, in the midst of hundreds of thousands of warriors, I went to batter down the walls of cities and to lay waste the provinces of mine enemies is more grievous unto me than the calamity that hath overtaken me in the meanness of mine estate, which hath incited them that but now were grovelling under my feet to desert my feebleness. O, angry fortune! will the day ever come wherein I may requite the evil turn that hath thus driven forth the length of my days and my poverty? O, Cordelia, my daughter, how true were the words wherein thou didst make answer unto me, when I did ask of thee how much thou didst love me! For thou saidst, So much as thou hast so much art thou worth, and so much do I love thee. So long, therefore, as I had that which was mine own to give, so long seemed I of worth unto them that were the lovers, not of myself, but of my gifts. They loved me at times, but better loved they the presents I made unto them. Now that the presents are no longer forthcoming, they too have gone their ways. But with what face, O thou dearest of my

* Lear, Leir, or in Welsh, Llyr, was the son of Prince Bladud who founded Bath, and 'he it was that builded the city on the river Soar, that in the British is called Kaer Lyr, but in the Saxon, Leicester' (II, xi).

children, shall I dare appear before thee? I who, wroth with thee for these thy words, was minded to marry thee less honourably than thy sisters, who, after all the kindnesses I have conferred upon them, have allowed me to become an outcast and a beggar?’

But to revert to the story of Arthur. It is here, as we have said, that Geoffrey assumes the manner and the liberties of a deliberate romancer. He concentrates all the resources of his art, such as they are—and he is, to say the least, no mean rhetorician—upon the exaltation of the prowess and the dignity of the British prince. That Geoffrey had a good conceit of the qualities of his own race, and was ambitious of subduing his readers into a belief in the transcendent valour and doughtiness of the ancient Britons, is obvious from several incidental passages in the ‘History.’ Thus, when he tells of the resistance offered by the Britons to Julius Cæsar, he breaks out into the following dithyrambic strain of praise :—

‘O, but in those days was the British race worthy of all admiration, which had twice driven in flight before them him who had subjected the whole world beside unto himself, and even in defeat now withstood him whom no nation of the earth had been able to withstand, ready to die for their country and their freedom! To their praise it was that Lucan sang how Cæsar,

‘Scared when he found the Britons that he sought for,
Only displayed his craven back before them.’

Again, when deploring the sorry straits of the Britons in their struggles with the marauding Piets and Scots after the departure of the Romans, he exclaims :—

O, the vengeance of God upon past sins! Such was the doom that befell through the wicked madness of Maximian that had drained the kingdom of so many gallant warriors, for, had they been present in so sore a strait, no people could have fallen upon them that they would not have forced to flee, as was well seen, so long as they remained in the land.’

But a warrior was to arise who would once more assert the supremacy of the British people, and would not only crush the power of Scots and Piets and of every other race from the North that afflicted the peace of

Britain, but would even compel the once victorious Romans to pay tribute to himself, and would fulfil the prophecies that 'for the third time should one of British race be born who should obtain the empire of Rome.' That warrior was Arthur. So contagious was his might that the entire nation renewed its youth under his sway and surpassed the glories of its prime. For, in the last battle with the Romans,

'the Britons pursue them, take them prisoners, plunder them, put them miserably to the sword, insomuch as that the more part of them stretch forth their hands womanishwise to be bound so only they might have yet a little space longer to live. The which, verily, might seem to have been ordained by providence divine, seeing that whereas in days of yore the Romans had persecuted the grandsires of the Britons with their unjust oppressions, so now did the Britons in defence of the freedom whereof they would have bereft them, and refusing the tribute that they did unrighteously demand, take vengeance on the grandchildren of the Romans.'

In character with all this is the glorification of the personal prowess of Arthur himself. His first great exploit, as recorded by Geoffrey, was at the battle of Badon Hill or Bath, where he 'slew four hundred and seventy men single-handed with his sword Caliburn.' His accoutrements in this battle are enumerated with an attention to picturesque detail which anticipates the elaborate descriptions of the later romances. His 'Caliburn, best of swords,' had been forged 'within the Isle of Avalon'; and the 'lance that did grace his right hand was called Ron,* a tall lance and a stout, full meet to do slaughter withal.' Upon his head was 'a helm of gold graven with the semblance of a dragon'; his shield was called 'Priwen, wherein was painted the image of holy Mary, Mother of God, that many a time and oft did call her back unto his memory.'† The figure which Geoffrey thus calls up before his imagination becomes, by a natural

* The names of Arthur's weapons must have been long current in Welsh folklore, for we find them in the archaic romance of 'Kulhwch and Olwen,' 'Priwen' in that tale is the name given to Arthur's ship, not his shield.

† Cf. Wordsworth, 'Ecclesiastical Sonnets,' I, 10 :—

'Amazement runs before the towering casque
Of Arthur, bearing through the stormy field
The Virgin sculptured on his Christian shield.'

process of extension, the flower and the pattern of knight-hood. For Arthur,

'inviting unto him all soever of most prowess from far-off kingdoms, began to multiply his household retinue, and to hold such courtly fashion in his household as begat rivalry amongst peoples at a distance, insomuch as the noblest in the land, fain to vie with him, would hold himself as naught, save in the cut of his clothes and the manner of his arms he followed the pattern of Arthur's knights.'

He thus becomes not only the head of a brilliant knightly court, but, drawing many principedoms under him, he becomes the war-lord of a host of military chieftains until 'his prowess was upon every man's tongue even unto the uttermost ends of the earth, and a fear fell upon the kings of realms oversea lest he might fall upon them in arms.' So 'his heart was uplifted for that he was a terror to them all, and he set his desire upon subduing the whole of Europe unto himself.' Norway, Denmark, Gaul, in fact the whole of western Europe, fall under his sway, until at last he becomes powerful enough to challenge and to conquer the hosts of Rome itself.

But, before telling of the expedition against Rome, Geoffrey pauses to give an account of Arthur's coronation at Caerleon-upon-Usk and of the glories of his court at that 'passing pleasant place.' In these chapters on Arthur at Caerleon we have all the pomp of high romance, and all the colour and splendour of the dawning age of chivalry. Magnificent ceremonials, sumptuous banquets, tourneys, and games, give life and brilliance to the picture. Caerleon itself, 'abounding in wealth above all other cities, was the place most meet for so high a solemnity.' The magnificence of its kingly palaces 'with the gilded verges of the roofs that imitated Rome'; its cathedral church of 'the third metropolitan see of Britain'; its college of 'two hundred philosophers learned in astronomy and other arts'—all 'did by true inferences foretell the prodigies which at that time were about to befall unto King Arthur.' When the bidding to the coronation went out, 'not a single prince of any price on this side Spain remained at home and came not upon the proclamation; and no marvel, for Arthur's bounty was of common report throughout the whole wide world,

and all men for his sake were fain to come.' The description of the ceremonial itself is pitched in the same high key; indeed words altogether fail Geoffrey to conjure up all the superlative splendours of the scene.

'In the palace of the Queen no less did numberless pages, clad in divers brave liveries, offer their service, each after his office, the which were I to go about to describe I might draw out my history into an endless prolixity. For at that time was Britain exalted unto so high a pitch of dignity as that it did surpass all other kingdoms in plenty of riches, in luxury of adornment, and in the courteous wit of them that dwelt therein. Whatsoever knight in the land was of renown for his prowess did wear his clothes and his arms all of one same colour. And the dames no less witty, would apparel them in like manner in a single colour, nor would they deign have the love of none save he had thrice approved him in the wars. Wherefore at that time did dames wax chaste and knights the nobler for their love.'

No passage affords a better illustration than this of the manner in which Geoffrey prepared the way for the entry of his Arthur to the sovereignty of the kingdom of chivalric romance. The mounting tale of his far-reaching exploits, and the place assigned to him as the head of a great retinue of princes and courtly knights, make the transition easy to the conception of the Round Table and to all the other extensions of the romantic schools. Nor is the element of wonder and of strange adventure, so largely developed by later romancers, absent from Geoffrey's narrative. The 'marvels of Britain,' as originally recounted by Nennius, are woven into the story of Arthur's victorious marches, with, of course, many rhetorical embellishments. Arthur himself is represented as performing deeds as hazardous as those of any knight-errant of the romances. He engages in single combat with the Roman tribune, Flollo, a man of 'mighty stature, hardihood, and valour,' whose skull is cloven in twain by the terrible Caliburn. He fights and kills a Spanish giant at St Michael's Mount upon being told that the monster had carried away and killed the niece of Hoel, Duke of Armorica. The issue of this combat leads Arthur to recall his victory over a still more formidable foe, the giant Ritho of Mount Eryri, who 'had fashioned him a furred cloak of the beards of the kings he had

slain.' In the battles with the Romans, again, the British king does Homeric deeds, for 'naught might armour avail' his enemies, 'but that Caliburn would carve their souls from out them with their blood.'

Thus, by his own individual prowess and the gathering might of his arms, the British king pursues his triumphal progress through Europe until he meditates a descent upon the city of Rome itself. He had actually begun to climb the Alps 'when message was brought him that his nephew Mordred, unto whom he had committed the charge of Britain, had tyrannously and traitorously set the crown of the kingdom upon his own head, and had linked him in unhallowed union with Guinevere, the Queen, in despite of her former marriage.' The tragic end of his victorious career is now within sight. He gives battle to the traitor at the river Camel. Mordred is defeated and slain; but in the same battle 'the renowned King Arthur himself was wounded unto death and was borne thence unto the island of Avalon for the healing of his wounds.' In these last words we hear an echo of the famous Celtic tradition about 'Arthur's return.' 'Unknown is the grave of Arthur,' sang an old Welsh bard; or, as Professor Rhys would, still more significantly, translate the words, 'not wise the thought of a grave for Arthur.' The greatest marvel of all Arthur's life is that of his passing:

'And where is he who knows?

From the great deep to the great deep he goes.'

'Some men say yet' (writes Malory in his quaint way) 'that King Arthur is not dead, but had by the will of our Lord Jesu into another place. And men say that he shall come again, and he shall win the holy cross. I will not say it shall be so, but rather I will say, here in this world he changed his life. But many men say that there is written upon his tomb this verse, "*Hic jacet Arthurus Rex quondam Rexque futurus.*"'

The extracts we have given suffice to show that Geoffrey's contribution to Arthurian romance is large and original enough to establish beyond question his title to be called the literary father of the 'matter of Britain.' His place in literary history is to be determined not by any pedantic investigation of his 'origins,' his credentials his authenticity, but by a frank recognition of his immense

influence upon imaginative literature. And, in English at least, few works can boast of so various and distinguished a literary progeny as the 'History of the Kings of Britain.' The long line of chroniclers, in both prose and verse, from Layamon and Robert of Gloucester down to Grafton and Holinshed, who believed that Geoffrey had, in all good faith, 'revealed the marvellous current of forgotten things,' alone forms a signal monument to his genius. But it is from the poets that he receives the tribute which best accords with the character and the spirit of his work. The direct debt which most of them owe to Geoffrey may, on a strict computation, seem to be small; but no other early British writer can be said to have so persistently haunted the imagination of so many English poets of the first rank. Shakespeare, Spenser, Milton, Dryden, Wordsworth, Tennyson, are all 'besy for to bere up' Geoffrey's fame. Spenser's tribute to his book has been already quoted. Let us conclude with Wordsworth's praise, in 'Artegal and Elidure,' of the

'British record long concealed

In old Armorica, whose secret springs
No Gothic conqueror ever drank':

in which, he continues,

'We read of Spenser's fairy themes,
And those that Milton loved in youthful years;
The sage enchanter Merlin's subtle schemes;
The feats of Arthur and his knightly peers;
Of Arthur, who, to upper light restored,

With that terrific sword
Which yet he brandishes for future war
Shall lift his country's fame above the polar star!'

W. LEWIS JONES.

Art. IV.—THE ORIGINS OF THE IRISH RACE.

1. *A Social History of Ancient Ireland.* By P. W. Joyce LL.D. Two vols. London: Longmans, 1903.
2. *The Life of St Patrick and his Place in History.* By J. B. Bury, M.A. London: Macmillan, 1905.
3. *The Life and Writings of St Patrick.* By the Most Rev. Dr Healy, Archbishop of Tuam. Dublin: Gill, 1905.
4. *History of Ireland from the Earliest Times to the Year 1547.* By the Rev. E. A. D'Alton, C.C. Vol. I. Dublin: Sealy, 1903.

'IRELAND,' says Dr Joyce in the book which stands at the head of our list, and which, in its way, forms an admirable compendium or catalogue of all that has hitherto been found bearing upon the manners and customs, the religion, laws, literature, industrial arts, and social life of the ancient Irish, 'presents the spectacle of an arrested civilisation.' It is a neat phrase, and expresses what may be regarded as the orthodox view on the subject. Whether it is the correct one is another matter; and we propose, as briefly as may be, to examine it in the light of modern historical research, and in connexion with the following statements, on which it may be said to rest.

'The institutions, arts, and customs of ancient Ireland, with few exceptions, grew up from within, almost wholly unaffected by external influence' (p. 3). 'The ancient Irish were a branch of the continental Celts, and they brought with them the language, mythology, and customs of their original home, all of which, however, became modified in course of ages after the separation' (p. 24). 'One momentous effect of the Danish and Anglo-Norman invasions must here be noted: they arrested the progress of native learning and art, which, though disturbed by the Danes, still lingered on for several centuries after the first English settlements, but gradually declined, and finally died out. Ireland presents the spectacle of an arrested civilisation. What that civilisation would have come to if allowed to follow out uninterruptedly its natural course of development it is now impossible to tell, and useless to conjecture; but there is no reason to think that in this respect Irishmen would not have kept well abreast with the rest of the world' (p. 5).

In other words, we are told to regard the ancient Irish as a homogeneous race, of Celtic origin, bringing with them to Ireland their customs, arts, and institutions, and developing them there uninterruptedly until the arrival of the Danes and Anglo-Normans first interfered with and finally put an end to a civilisation which otherwise might have grown into something great and lasting. This, then, is the general view on the subject which we propose to consider. It may perhaps be well if we at once state the conclusions we have formed, merely premising that nothing is offered dogmatically in a matter so obscure, but rather by way of suggestion and as a possible means of rescuing early Irish history from the *cul de sac* into which it has found its way. First, then, there is every reason to believe that the ancient Irish (using the words in the sense of Dr Joyce) were not a single, homogeneous, nor in the main a Celtic people; secondly, we have good grounds for concluding that when the Celtic or, more probably, Celtiberian conquerors arrived in Ireland they found the inhabitants of the country in a comparatively well-advanced state of civilisation; thirdly, there are good reasons for regarding the Celtic or Celtiberian conquest of Ireland as the work of a relatively small body of invaders, resembling the Norman conquests of England and Sicily; fourthly, there is little doubt that Irish Christianity and what is called 'late Celtic' art are essentially Eastern in their origin and have little or nothing to do with Rome or Constantinople; fifthly, there is little question that the Danish invasions (apart from mere acts of piracy) served rather to develop Irish civilisation and increase the chance of national unity than the reverse; and finally, we hold that Irish civilisation perished of its own effeteness and inability to stand against a superior and more highly developed civilisation. These six propositions we propose to treat singly and in the order given; but, before doing so, we desire to refer for a moment to the account given by Keating and other Irish historians of the early invasions of Ireland. We know the twofold danger we hereby run, of trying the reader's patience and apparently prejudicing our argument. But we mean merely to state the gist of the story, and to leave it to the reader to draw his own inferences in the light of what follows.

Irish legendary (or perhaps we should rather say traditional) history tells of six separate invasions—a prediluvian, a Partholonian, a Nemedian, a Firbolgan, a Dedannan, and a Milesian or Gadelian. Dismissing the first invasion as purely fabulous, Keating says of the later invaders that they were members of the same family, being all alike descended from Magog, the son of Japhet. Of Partholon it is only necessary to remark that he and his whole colony were destroyed by pestilence. To Partholon succeeded Nemedius, who, like him, came somehow or other from the neighbourhood of the Euxine. During the Nemedian period Ireland was overrun by a race of pirates called the Fomorians. To these Fomorians is ascribed the erection of the earliest stone forts in Ireland. Under pressure of their attacks the Nemedians quitted Ireland and went to Greece, whence they returned later as the Firbolgs.

According to Keating, the Firbolgs were never entirely extirpated; and he mentions three clans which in his day were believed to descend from them. During the reign of their last king, Eochaidh, who was the first monarch to give laws to the people, Ireland was invaded and conquered by the Dedannans. Now the Dedannans were a race of wizards, who came to Ireland from the neighbourhood of the Gulf of Corinth by way of Scandinavia. At their departure from Norway they took with them four 'curiosities,' viz. the *lia fail* or stone of destiny, a sword, a spear, and a cauldron. Touching the north of Scotland, they finally reached Ireland, where they put an end to the Firbolgs in one battle, and to the Fomorians in another.

We come last to the Milesians. Baath, the eldest son of Magog and the ancestor of the Milesians, had a son, Fenius Farsaidh, King of Scythia, a man of profound learning, who, after spending long years in Babylonia, where he founded numerous schools and assisted at the invention of an alphabet, returned to Scythia and died. He left two sons, Neanul, who succeeded him, and Niul, who, having no portion, went with his followers to seek his fortune in Egypt. It would exhaust the patience of the reader to describe the wanderings of his descendants from the time they left Egypt till they arrived in Spain; all that it is necessary to remark is that they reached the

latter country by following a northerly route like the Dedannans when they came to Ireland. Their king, Breogan, under whom they conquered nearly the whole of Spain, had ten sons, of whom we need mention only Ith and Bile.

The son of Bile was the famous Gallamh, called Milesius of Spain. Determining to visit Scythia, Milesius sailed thither through the Mediterranean. The story of his wanderings through Egypt, Crete, and the Euxine to Gothland and thence back to Spain is merely a repetition, *totidem verbis*, of that of Niul and his descendants. Returning to Spain he found his people hard put to it to hold their own against certain invaders. After consultation it was resolved to go in search of an island lying in the West, which an old prophecy declared they should one day possess. The command of the expedition was given to Ith. Reaching Ireland safely, he was surprised to find that the inhabitants spoke the same language as himself. Having visited the three Dedannan princes, he was returning to his ships when he was waylaid by them and mortally wounded. He died on his way back to Spain, and his son Lughaidh, bringing his body ashore, declared the manner of his death 'before an assembly of the descendants of Milesius and the sons of Breogan.'

The indignation of the Milesians knew no bounds; and, having fitted out an expedition, they sailed with their wives and families from Tor Breogan in Galicia for the purpose of wresting the island from the Dedannans. After narrowly escaping complete shipwreck they succeeded in effecting a landing—Heber at Inbher Sceine in Munster, Heremon at Inbher Colpa, now Drogheda. Uniting their forces they overthrew the Dedannans at Tailten and divided the kingdom between them, Heremon taking Leinster and Connaught, and Heber the two provinces of Munster, while Ulster was assigned to Heber, the grandson of Milesius. After reigning together peaceably for one year, Heber and Heremon quarrelled, and, the former having been killed at the battle of Geisiol, Heremon became sole monarch of Ireland. But the descendants of Heber remained in the land and gave many sovereigns to the people. Such is the gist of the story of the invasions as given by Keating. Its significance will appear as we proceed.

Coming to Ireland itself, we find, scattered up and down the country, and preserved in its museums, tangible evidence of the presence of a prehistoric race. Of the existence of palæolithic man in Ireland we have no certain proof. We will not say he never existed there; but, so far as our present knowledge goes, Irish history or prehistory begins with man of the later neolithic age. Evidence of his presence, as we have said, meets us on all sides, in the shape of pillar-stones, cromlechs or dolmens, stone forts, *souterrains*, 'crannog' dwellings, burial urns, and articles of stone, bone, bronze, iron, etc. All these remains have been carefully studied by distinguished archæologists, such as Boyd Dawkins, James Fergusson, Jewitt, Brash, Wood-Martin, Coffey, Westropp, and others. Their conclusions possess the greatest importance for us; but at present we are chiefly concerned in trying to find out if these prehistoric remains can be ascribed to any particular race, and, if so, whence that race came, and how it reached Ireland. We must turn our eyes to the East, to that *officina gentium*, the valley of the Euphrates, for a starting-point.

'It is' (says Prof. Gurlitt, 'Geschichte der Kunst') 'becoming every day clearer that the centre of the oldest civilisation is the lower valley of the Euphrates. . . . Comparative philology enables us to describe the people who had here established themselves as probably Turko-Mongolian.'

Now, while we are not prepared to accept this theory (for more than theory it can hardly yet be called) so entirely as does Gurlitt, still, so far as the trend of modern research goes, there seems good ground to believe that the historical starting-point of human civilisation is to be looked for precisely where he places it; and to ascribe the earliest form of culture, including the invention of cuneiform writing, to a non-Semitic race whose language may properly be called the Sumerian.* Further than this we cannot go with certainty; but Hommel's view ('Geschichte Babyloniens') possesses great attraction for us; and, if it should actually turn out, as he conjectures and Ernst Bonnell more confidently asserts, that there is a direct relationship between the Sumerian language and the Basque, we have here a fact which may

* Cf. Weissbach, 'Die Sumerische Frage' (Leipzig, 1898).

help considerably in solving the problem, who were the earliest inhabitants of Ireland, and whence they came.

We have to imagine that in the dim past, long before the dawn of history proper, a mountain people of Scythian * origin, abandoning their nomadic habits, came down from their seats between the Ural and Altai mountains and formed a settlement in the neighbourhood of the Caspian Sea. One branch of the family (the Sumerian or Sumero-Akkadian) appeared as the pioneers of civilisation in the valley of the Euphrates; another (to which the name Pelasgo-Alarodian has been given, including the Pelasgians, Etruscans, and Iberians) pushed its way into Greece, Italy, and Spain; a third (the Finno-Ugrian) took a northward course to the shores of the Baltic and White Sea; while a fourth (the Mongolian) journeyed eastward to the shores of the Yellow Sea. Subsequently, in historic times, two other nations, the Hungarian and Turko-Tartar, emerged from the same cradle of the race. By what routes and in what order these migrations took place we do not know; but, so far as Europe is concerned, we can only conjecture that it was at first by following the course of some great river like the Volga or Danube, or by skirting the shores of the Mediterranean, while, from their position on the Atlantic sea-board, it may reasonably be presumed that the Iberians were in the van of the movement. But centuries must have elapsed before they reached their final homes on the shores of the Atlantic.

It is with this Iberian or, as it is variously called, Lappanoid, or Ibero-Insular, or Atlanto-Mediterranean race that we are now specially concerned. Of its existence as the earliest and lowest stratum of population over the greater part of western Europe, there can be no question. It was a long-headed, long-faced race of medium and rather slender stature, with dark-brown or black hair, dark eyes and rather broad nose.† To these characteristics we may add that it was a seafaring, sea-loving, dolmen-building race, accustomed to bury and not to burn its dead, speaking a language of an agglutinative

* We use the attribute advisedly. Cf. Hoernes, 'Urgeschichte,' pp. 314, 453.

† W. Z. Ripley, 'Races of Europe' (London, 1900).

type, and having for religion a sort of Shamanism or ancestor-worship. Vestiges of it are still to be traced in the Basques of the Pyrenees; but, except as skeleton or framework, its identity has long ago been lost in the mixture of races that Europe has since undergone. The race, as race, has disappeared, and its language has died out. But its works still survive; and a map of the dolmens of Europe, such as is to be found in Fergusson's 'Rude Stone Monuments,' may be taken to describe pretty accurately the territorial limits of the Iberian dominion. With its centre in what is now the department of Morbihan, it extended northwards through Holland, Denmark, and Pomerania into Scandinavia, with offshoots to the south-west of England and Wales, the north of Scotland (including the Orkneys) and Ireland; southwards through central France to the Gulf of Lyons, along the Pyrenees, round the coast of Spain, and even as far as Africa and Corsica.

That Ireland was inhabited by the Iberians may be regarded as a well established fact, for not only are the same evidences of their presence to be found there as on the Continent, but, if Prof. Rhys is right in his conjecture,* the very name of the island—Hibernia, Juverna, 'Ιέπνη (Ιφέπνη) Iverna or Ivvera, Iveriio—is conclusive on this point; and there seems really no reason why we should not at this time speak of the country as Iverna and the people as Ivernians. Taking it for granted, then, that Ireland or Iverna formed part of what we may call greater Iberia, we have now to ask if it is possible to find out how these Iberians or Ivernians came thither. The subject has recently attracted considerable attention owing to the discovery of certain scratchings or sculpturings on the stones composing the tumuli of New Grange and Dowth in County Louth and elsewhere, the importance of which has been more clearly revealed by the systematic study of comparative types of ornamentation. Reproductions of these scratchings are impossible here, and we must claim the indulgence of the reader for referring him to Mr Coffey's admirably illustrated articles in the 'Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy.'

Of these sculpturings the most instructive is that

* 'Studies in Early Irish History.' Proc. Brit. Acad., vol. i (1905).

representing the spiral motive. The history of the spiral ascends to the very remotest times. It has been found on Egyptian scarabs dating from the fifth dynasty, among Cretan remains of about 2500 years B.C., in Scandinavia, and in prehistoric Ireland. The study of primitive ornamentation is still in its infancy, and we do not feel sure that many inferences drawn from it, especially such as connect particular types with particular race movements, are altogether justifiable, for, as a matter of fact, the spiral is to be found nearly everywhere. At the same time it must be admitted that the attempt to use it as a clue in tracing the progress of civilisation has been attended with considerable success. For us it is specially interesting as tending to show that the earliest civilising influences that reached Ireland are directly traceable through Scandinavia * along the great trade route of the Elbe and Danube to Mycenæ and thence probably to Babylonia, either directly or indirectly, through Crete and Egypt. In confirmation of this view Mr Westropp has convincingly shown † that 'the chain of ruined forts (of the same type as are found in Ireland) extends without a break from Thessaly and Bosnia, through Hungary and Prussia, the Low Countries, France, Switzerland, and the British Isles.' In other words, he has shown that the forts follow the same lines as the spiral. But, if we need have little hesitation in believing that the earliest civilisation reached Ireland mainly by a northerly route, there are good grounds for concluding that a sort of back-current existed between Ireland and Morbihan. The fact is (as we shall more than once have occasion to observe) that Ireland, from its position, has always served as a sort of scrap-heap for Europe. Systems that have worked themselves out elsewhere have survived there into quite recent times. In any case, we must always be careful not to identify movements of races with currents of civilisation. The two are sometimes, but not always or necessarily, to be found in connexion.

To resume. We have good reason to believe that Ireland in prehistoric times was, like most of western

* Cf. Montelius, 'Les temps préhistoriques en Suède.'

† 'Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy,' xxxi, part xiv.

Europe, inhabited by a dark-skinned, dark-haired, long-headed race of Scythian origin, to whom the name Ivernian seems most appropriate. From their original homes about the Caspian they had migrated thither, probably by following the course of the Danube and Elbe, through Scandinavia, in a thin intermittent stream. At first their settlements were confined to the coast, but gradually they pushed their way into the interior through a densely-wooded country. When we first find traces of them they had long since passed beyond the nomadic stage. Though chiefly a pastoral people they were acquainted with the arts of navigation, agriculture, and weaving. They lived together in settled communities, each probably under its own chief or king. They knew how to build houses of stone and earth; and round each group or village they threw up a strong rampart or palisade of stone or earth, as the conditions of the ground dictated. Amongst their domestic animals they counted the cow, the sheep, the goat, the dog, and the horse. Their weapons and household utensils consisted of stone, bone, and bronze, the last of which they brought to a high state of development. They buried their dead as often as not in their own dwellings, and over their heroes or chiefs they raised huge megalithic buildings or tumuli. Their religion took the form of ancestor-worship, and culminated in what we know as Druidism, which probably involved human sacrifices. They worshipped no visible gods made with their own hands, but they believed that the earth and sea were inhabited by good spirits, and that the evil genii dwelt in the air and wind. Finally, they probably possessed some means of communicating their thoughts in writing, of which Ogam is a later development.

As we have remarked, Ireland has always been somewhat behind the rest of Europe; and what we have called greater Iberia had passed away before she felt the shock of a new invasion. When the change came, about 300-200 B.C., it came gradually. The old life went on developing itself, owing to the reception of new elements, into a higher form of civilisation; but, throughout what we are pleased to call Celtic times, the old element subsisted as basis and groundwork of the nation. To the consideration of this change we now turn.

Whether we are entitled to speak of a 'Celtic race' is a question that will be answered in a different sense according as we approach it from the standpoint of history or from that of anthropology. It is indisputable that, after Europe had been to a great extent peopled by a long-headed race, a new race with relatively round heads, broad faces, light chestnut-coloured hair, hazel-grey eyes, of medium height and rather bulky, appeared on the scene. Whether we like to call this new race Celtic, or Celto-Slavic, or Alpine, is a matter of indifference; only we must be careful to distinguish between it and the Celts of history; for it is every day becoming clearer that the view broached by Roget de Belloguet so far back as 1869, to the effect that the Celts of history never at any time formed more than a comparatively small governing class in Europe, is the correct one. It is not our intention to discuss the Celtic question here, except in so far as Ireland is concerned; but, as it is still the custom to talk vaguely but dogmatically of Celts and Aryans, it will be useful to ask how the problem is regarded by scholars on the Continent.

'There is some reason' (say MM. Bertrand and Reinach*) 'to believe that we are on the right track [i.e. in following de Belloguet]. For not only have the Celts never formed the bulk of the population in Gaul, but they are, in a sense, quite recent arrivals there. When we meet with them on the left bank of the Rhine they are always mixed with earlier peoples.'

In a similar strain Niese writes:—

'We are led to conclude that the Celts of South Germany, Bohemia, Pannonia, and the neighbouring Alpine lands, had established themselves there at as early a period as those on the left bank of the Rhine in Gaul. By what route they arrived there we cannot say with certainty; but it is utterly impossible to believe with Müllenhoff, on the authority of Livy's narrative, that they came thither from the Rhine. On the contrary, it is extremely probable that the movement was in the opposite direction. Müllenhoff and others have convincingly shown that the Celts had not established themselves in South France till after 500 B.C. Only in later times did they succeed in reaching the coast, and there is every reason to

* 'Les Celtes dans les vallées du Pô et du Danube' (Paris, 1894).

suppose that the movement was due to pressure of other tribes pushing their way across the Rhine.*

It is true that de Jubainville has quite recently† developed a theory of a double invasion of the British Isles by the Celts, the first prior to 800 B.C., the second about 300 B.C. The first invasion is a mare's nest. The whole theory rests on a suggestion thrown out by Reinach that 'kassiteros,' found in Homer ('Iliad,' xxiii, 561), meaning tin, is at the same time a Celtic word for Britain, and, but for de Jubainville's deservedly high reputation, would deserve no notice. For our own part we think that the view represented by Niese, which has also the sanction of Bertrand, is the only sound one; and that we are justified in concluding that it was not till about 400 B.C. that the Celts succeeded in establishing themselves along the Atlantic sea-board.

The question now arises, how and from what part of the Continent they managed eventually to reach Ireland. The usual view is that the Irish Celts or Goidels (or Gaels) made their way from the north of France and Belgium across the Channel to Britain, whence they were compelled to move to Ireland owing to the British Celts or Brythons pressing on them from behind. From the side of history as well as from that of philology the view is untenable. Professor Rhys‡ seems aware of the fact; but he has placed himself in the dilemma of having either to suppose 'that, before the Galli and Belgæ came west, the Celtæ (Goidels) must be regarded as having made themselves masters of the coast from the Rhine to the Seine'—which is a wholly unwarranted assumption, and contrary to his argument—or of having to transport them from the west of France to Ireland by sea, which he regards as impossible. Now, so far as the Celts are concerned, we believe he is perfectly correct in supposing that the Bay of Biscay must have been an insuperable obstacle. For, in contradistinction to the Iberians, the Celts were no sailors; and it is a curious fact that, in Cæsar's time, the only Gallic tribe possessing anything

* 'Keltische Wanderung' in 'Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum,' vol. 42, p. 151.

† 'Les Celtes'; cf. 'Les premiers habitants de l'Europe.'

‡ 'Celtæ and Galli.' Proc. Brit. Acad., vol. II.

like a fleet were the Veneti, who, there is good reason to believe, were not Celts at all, but Iberians.

But we venture to suggest that there is another way out of the difficulty. Hitherto, in this discussion, we have purposely refrained from referring to Irish legendary history, and, if we refer to it now, it is only to call attention to the fact that in the legends special stress is laid on the north-west corner of the Spanish peninsula as the point of departure, and the south-west corner of Ireland as the point of arrival, of the Milesian invaders. We are inclined to attach great weight to this statement; first, because the historic memory of peoples in an early stage can be trusted to remember roughly what happened three or four hundred years earlier; and secondly, because we believe it accurately expresses what actually occurred.

Describing the course of the river Ister, Herodotus, writing about 400 B.C., says that it took its rise among the Celts in the neighbourhood of the city of Pyrene. Now the Celts, he proceeds (ii, 33), are a people beyond the Pillars of Hercules, bordering on the Cynetes, who dwell farthest west of the inhabitants of Europe. Avienus, in his '*Ora Maritima*,' embodying an earlier account, is even more precise. We have therefore little hesitation in concluding that, about 400 B.C., the Celts had pushed their way westwards across the Pyrenees till they came in contact with a people or tribe called the Cynetes. That these Cynetes were Iberians seems certain; and from the position assigned to them we infer that they occupied that part of the Spanish peninsula whence the sons of Milesius are said to have come. What followed on this impact may be gathered from Diodorus Siculus, who, writing about 20 B.C., says:—

The two nations, Celts and Iberians, heretofore breaking forth into a war about the boundaries of their countries, at length agreed to inhabit together promiscuously, and so marrying one with another, their issue and posterity (they say) afterwards were called Celtiberians. Two potent nations being thus united, and possessed likewise of a rich and fertile country, these Celtiberians became very famous and renowned, so that the Romans had much ado to subdue them after long and tedious wars with them.' (Booth's translation, bk. v, ch. 2.)

In this union of Celt with Iberian, in which the former was so far the dominant element as to impress its language on the whole group, we have got what we take to be the real origin of the legend of the sons of Milesius. Remembering, as Lamprecht has pointed out,* that genealogy is one of the earliest forms in which history expresses itself, we can easily understand how, in trying to give historical form to the tradition of the invasion of Ireland by a mixed race, the Irish historians should have assigned to Airemon or Heremon (representing the Celtic element) and Emher or Heber (representing the Iberian) a common father, Galamh or Milesius, meaning simply a man of valour.† The presence of Ith in the story evidently points to a pre-Celtiberian, i.e. pure Iberian, period both in Spain and Ireland.

The only difficulty that now confronts us is how to get our Celtiberians from Spain to Ireland. The difficulty was felt by Keating, and all who have touched the subject, to be a serious one. But, if the invasion we have to do with was not pure Celtic, and if, as we have shown,‡ the Iberians were pre-eminently a maritime race, then it cannot be regarded as insuperable. No doubt the voyage was in those days, as long afterwards, a formidable undertaking; and we think we see evidence in the story that it narrowly escaped being an entire failure. But the real difficulty followed the landing. The Iberians were no despicable opponents, as Diodorus lets us see. In the end, however, thanks to their superior weapons and civilisation, the little band of invaders succeeded in making themselves masters of the country. But there was no question of driving out or extirpating the old Iberian population. Though relatively few in number, they were overwhelmingly more numerous than the invaders. The old process of assimilation that had gone on in Spain repeated itself in Ireland. For a time the two elements in the invasion worked together harmoniously, but in the end the Celt got the upper hand. But it was more a victory of civilisation than of race. There was no breach with the past. New elements were added, but the old life went on in a continuous stream. In the

* 'Moderne Geschichtswissenschaft.'

† Cf. Rhys, 'Studies in Early Irish History.'

‡ For further evidence cf. de Jubainville 'Les premiers habitants' I 25.

six hundred years that elapsed between the invasion and the coming of St Patrick, Ireland became a Celtic country so far as its governing class, its language, and its political institutions were concerned ; but the basis of its population remained, as it had been from the first, Iberian.

Cut off, as she has always in large measure been, from the main current of European history, Ireland proceeded to work out her own destiny, undisturbed by foreign influences and the tramp of the Roman legions. We are not indeed to suppose that she was so far isolated as to hear no rumours of what was going on in the great world across the seas. The old channels of communication that connected her with Scandinavia, with Britain, and with the west of Gaul, still remained open ; and there is little doubt that she carried on, even in these early times, a considerable commerce in gold, slaves, and other articles of luxury. Roman coins, dating from the Republic down to Honorius, have been found in different parts of the island ; and it is hardly conceivable that some knowledge of the great change that had come over the world after the formal adoption of Christianity by Constantine should not have reached her. Lying outside the Empire, she was nevertheless in touch with it ; and it would be unreasonable, even if we cannot draw such weighty inferences as some writers have drawn from the mission of Palladius as first bishop 'ad Scotos in Christum credentes,' to doubt that Christianising influences had made themselves felt in Ireland even before Patrick's time. Be this as it may, it was Patrick who first drew Ireland within the circle of the Christian Church of the Empire. We are not going to presume on the reader's patience by commenting at any length on the life of the apostle. An occasional reference to Prof. Bury's scholarly but, for the unwary, perhaps rather dangerous work will suffice. For us Patrick is here chiefly interesting as opening up a new channel of civilisation for Ireland.

At what precise date and by what means Christianity first found access into Gaul is still far from clear. On the whole, however, it seems probable that its introduction was in the main due to Greek and Syrian merchants trading between the East and Marseilles towards the end of the first and the beginning of the second century. As

elsewhere, its progress was at first slow and painful. Even after its recognition by Constantine and the liberty of conscience secured to its professors by the edict of Milan, its influence was for a long time restricted to the cities along the Gulf of Lyons and the valley of the Rhone.* Gradually, however, and largely through the example of St Martin of Tours, missionary enterprise succeeded in partly dispelling the darkness. From the south the light spread northwards. As the power of the Church grew, its organisation in the fourth century became more perfectly developed. But with security came a certain measure of laxity. Abuses of one sort and another crept in; and a period of decline, accelerated by the inroads of the Barbarians, the Vandals, Sueves, and Alans, commenced. The quiet contemplation of the divine mysteries became impossible; and, in the growing unrest and dissatisfaction with the world at large, the ground was prepared for the reception of monasticism.

Now it is important to bear in mind that, as the Church of Gaul from the beginning looked to Asia Minor and not to Rome as her spiritual mother, so Gaulish monasticism was a direct importation from Egypt, and, as such, entailed practices and doctrines as to the orthodoxy of which the opinion of the Bishop of Rome had neither been asked nor offered. We are compelled to emphasise this point as a protest against the exaggerated importance attached by Prof. Bury to the position and influence of the Church of Rome at the end of the fourth century, and the conclusions he has thence drawn as to the character of St Patrick's mission (pp. 60-66, 169). In saying this we do not mean to deny to the Roman Church, as, in a measure, the representative to the world of the power and dignity and universality of the Roman Empire, an exceptional position in the minds of all Christians. This priority no one in those days would ever have dreamt of denying her. What we mean is that her own views as to her position had not taken definite shape. It was a question, not of authority, but of respect; and we are of opinion that, whatever respect may have been, and actually was, shown to the Roman decretals by the

* Cf. Harnack, 'Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums' (Leipzig, 1902).

bishops of Gaul in the fourth century, it was not until after Leo's quarrel with Hilary of Arles, and the sanction given to his decision by the edict of Valentinian III in 445, that the doctrine of the primacy of the Roman see began to acquire any practical value.

However we regard this matter, one thing is certain, viz. that when Patrick, escaping from his captors, took refuge in the newly-founded monastery of Lerins (accepting it as a fact that he did so), Southern Gaul was saturated with oriental theology, customs, and art. As Prof. Strzygowski says: 'So far as art is concerned, Gaul, in the fourth century, may be regarded as a province almost of the Oriental Church.*' The fact, indeed, is too well established to be questioned for a moment. Standing on Gallic soil, where the Latin language prevailed, with one hand stretched out towards the East and the other towards Ireland, Patrick represents for us the channel through which a new and higher culture found its way to the island of the West.

Holding these views on the subject, we confess that the so-called 'Roman mission' of St Patrick possesses little interest for us. Both Dr Healy and Prof. Bury believe that Patrick visited Rome; but, whereas the former places the visit about 432, before Patrick started on his missionary enterprise, the latter considers it to have occurred in 441, in the second year of the pontificate of Leo the Great, and after he had already been labouring eight years in Ireland. We cannot say that the arguments of the one are more convincing than those of the other. For ourselves, we are quite content to believe that, notwithstanding his longing to visit his native country, and even to go as far as Gaul, to look upon the faces of the brethren there, he held to his resolution not to do so;† and, having once entered on his missionary labours, he never again quitted Ireland. Where there was no motive there could be no necessity; and we insist that the idea of a visit to Rome, either in preparation for, or in confirmation of, his mission, is utterly foreign to the spirit of his times. From beginning to end Rome had nothing to do with Patrick's mission; and the attempt

* 'Kleinasiens ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte' (Leipzig, 1903).

† 'Confession,' sect. 43.

to prove the contrary is wasted labour. The man who really directed the mission was Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre. Apart from the fact that the evidence points to Auxerre (lying on the great road that connected Marseilles with the north) as the metropolis of the Celtic Church generally, it was at the feet of Germanus that Patrick had studied; it was Germanus who crushed Pelagianism in Britain; it was he who probably arranged the mission of Palladius; and it was he who consecrated Patrick and set him on his way to Ireland. Eight years later, when news of the success of the mission reached Rome, Pope Leo conferred his benediction on it — 'et probatus est in fide catolica Patricius episcopus.'

Coming to Ireland, Patrick brought with him the only form of Christianity with which he was acquainted, viz. that of the Church of Gaul. But he brought with him also a fiery zeal to preach Christ and Him crucified. First and foremost he was a missionary, not a theologian, not even an ecclesiastical organiser. Uncultured and unlearned, as he calls himself (and with reason), he had long mistrusted his ability to answer the call which he felt to be addressed to him. Friends, fearing the perils of the undertaking, had tried hard to dissuade him; enemies, grudging him the honour, had laid obstacles in his way. But, in the end, the grace of God prevailed; and he went, as he says, 'to preach the Gospel to the Irish tribes and to bear the insults of the unbelievers,' ready, if he should be found worthy, to lay down his life for Christ, but desirous rather to spend it in His service. Prof. Bury, whose belief in the 'Roman mission' (though he nowhere, we think, calls it such) leads him to conclude apparently that Patrick must have come to Ireland with his wallet full of the latest Roman fashions, is somewhat at a loss to account for the eccentric position occupied by the Irish Church in the sixth and seventh centuries, and suggests a relapse into a sort of pre-Patrician Christianity after Patrick's death (pp. 183, 215). This, we venture to say, is rather a substantial structure to raise on such a slight foundation as is afforded by the probable existence of Christian communities in Ireland before Patrick's arrival. Anyhow, the argument would have carried more weight if the 'relapse' had been restricted to the south, to which part it is generally agreed that these

communities were confined, whereas it was the north that offered the most stubborn resistance to romanising ideas in the seventh century.

The task that Patrick had undertaken was not a light one. Years passed away, and no information of his whereabouts seems to have reached his friends in Gaul. Perhaps it was this uncertainty, and the anxiety to know what had become of him, that led to the sending of Iserninus and Auxilius in 439; perhaps also it was his favourite pupil, Sachellus, who was the bearer of the glad news of his safety. In any case it was only about 440 that any definite report of the success of his mission reached the Continent. A year or so later Pope Leo, as we have seen, formally expressed his approbation of the mission; two years later still an Ulster annalist noted that Patrick was preaching the Gospel successfully in his province.

The way had been opened. Ireland, hitherto lying in heathen darkness, had been brought into communion with the Christian world. Slowly but surely the seed he had been at such pains to sow took root and ripened into a rich harvest. Patrick passed away; but there were others ready to take his place. As the wave of barbarian invasion, carrying destruction and desolation in its track, spread westwards over Europe, the intercourse between Gaul and Ireland, following the direct route from the mouth of the Loire to Wexford, became closer and more frequent. Crowds of fugitive monks, scholars, and artists, fleeing before the invading Frank, sought refuge in the only corner of the West that offered them a safe asylum. Soon even this refuge was denied them. Roman Britain, which had long been exposed to the attacks of the Saxon marauders, at last succumbed to them. The narrow seas swarmed with their galleys, cutting off Britain from all communication with Europe for more than a century. Ireland, sharing her fate in this respect, was happier in being spared the horrors of an invasion. The storm that was shaking Europe left her undisturbed; and, while Britain was being forcibly transformed into England, Ireland enjoyed a tranquillity unknown to the remainder of the Western world.

When an Irishman waxes eloquent over his own country, it is to Ireland, from the sixth to the ninth

century, that he points in justification. And rightly so. It is the golden period of the Irish Church, of Irish art, and Irish literature; the period in which Ireland made good her claim to the proud title of the Island of the Saints. Hitherto left behind in the race of civilisation, she became for a time the one luminous spot in a world of darkness. This she owed, not to her own resources, but to the skill and learning that had come from Gaul.

In saying this we do not wish to depreciate the skill and learning of Irish artists and scholars. On the contrary, notwithstanding all the praise lavished on them, we think the real merits of the Irish in this respect are not yet fully appreciated. What we are trying to do is simply to account for the fact that when, in the time of Gregory the Great, the wall of Saxon and Frankish heathenism began to break down, and the missionaries of Rome succeeded in pushing their way into England and Gaul, they were surprised at being confronted with a culture and an ecclesiastical organisation wholly strange to them, and in some respects, notably in the knowledge of Greek, higher than their own. The Irish were apt scholars, intelligent and enthusiastic; but it is ridiculous to suppose that a people just emerging from a state of semi-barbarism could of its own unaided efforts have produced such a masterpiece of art as the 'Book of Kells,' or have made itself master of all the learning of the civilised world. We take it to be indisputable that the origin of Irish art (of what is called 'late Celtic,' or *opus hibernicum*) is as unmistakably Gaulish as that of Irish Christianity; and that, just as the latter was due to the direct influence of the Church of Gaul, so the former is directly attributable to Gaulish exiles fleeing before the Frankish invader.

As we have said, the Irish were apt pupils. Their love of learning was intense. Wherever they could find a master, thither they flocked together by hundreds. Content with the flimsiest protection against the inclemency of the weather, they were daunted by no obstacles in the pursuit of learning. Gradually the fame of their schools spread to the neighbouring island and brought a fresh access of students. From Iona the light

spread to Northumbria, to Scandinavia,* and, at a somewhat later date, even to Iceland.

We have now come to the parting of the ways. From the beginning of the seventh century, though art and learning are still largely the handmaidens of the Church, Christianity and civilisation cease to be synonymous terms. The Rome of Gregory differed widely from the Rome of pre-Leonine times. What to Leo himself had been little better than an ideal was to Gregory in large measure a reality.† The respect which had been shown to Celestine, as metropolitan of the first Church of the West, and the representative of the mighty traditions of the past, had changed to obedience. Rome had learned to command; and the command went forth that there was to be an end of the eccentric position of the Irish Church. The struggle was a fierce and protracted one; and it was not till the twelfth century that conformity in all respects was established. While the struggle was at its fiercest, scores of Irish missionaries—SS. Columbanus, Gall, Cataldus, Fridolin, Colman, Kilian, and a host of others—quitted their country to preach the gospel in the darkest corners of the Continent. But it is not with their efforts, nor with those of Rome, that we are here directly concerned. We would rather call attention to the fact that, after communication had been re-established with the Continent, a fresh stream of civilising influence began to affect Ireland. In other words, at the time when Ireland was giving of her best, she was receiving fresh elements of strength from abroad.

Let the reader consider for a moment the secular learning of Dicuil, the geographer, and Scotus Erigena, the existence of cenobitic establishments in the islands of the West, the character and ornamentation of the 'Book of MacDurnan,' the Ardagh chalice, the cross of Cong, the high cross of Monasterboice, finally, the architectural style of the remains of Cormac's chapel on the Rock of Cashel; and then let him ask himself what it all means, and how it all came to be found in Ireland at

* Cf. Montellius, 'Die älteren Kulturperioden,' where the presence of the *opus hibernicum* in Sweden is referred to the third age of iron, i.e. from the beginning of the fifth to the commencement of the eighth century.

† Cf. Gregorovius, 'Geschichte der Stadt Rom,' II, ch. 3.

a time when literature, art, and science had almost disappeared in Europe. The eastern origin of the beehive cells and the round towers has long been a recognised fact; art critics have referred the illustrations of the 'Book of Kells' and the 'Book of MacDurnan' and the ornamentation of the cross of Cong to Byzantine influences; and architects have dubbed Cormac's chapel Irish-Romanesque. What we wish to point out is that all these things—the learning of Scotus, the illuminations of the 'Book of MacDurnan,' the ornamentation of the cross of Cong, and the architecture of Cormac's chapel—are as clearly traceable to the East, viz. to Syria and Asia Minor, as the beehive cells in the Isle of Aran or the round tower of Clondalkin. The whole forms part of a much wider movement, which it is here only possible to hint at. But it is interesting to find in Ireland a confirmation of those views as to the development of art and architecture in western Europe of which Prof. Strzygowski is the most eminent exponent.

'We have' (he says) 'to learn to regard as the real sources of so-called Romanesque art neither Roman nor, as it was originally called, and as many will still have it, Byzantine art, but the foundations of both, viz. the Hellenistic art of the Mediterranean area, and secondly, the vigorous impulse given by the Orient to Christianity. . . . Bréhier has shown how, in the first eight centuries, the West was overflowed by Orientals, including Armenians; and how, next to merchants and monks, artists were the chief propagators of the movement; . . . and I am pretty certain that Scheffer-Boichorst is very much mistaken when he supposes that the lively influx of Syrians underwent a diminution in consequence of the conquest of Syria by the Arabs. On the contrary, it was perhaps in the first centuries after this event that just the best Christian element emigrated to the Frankish Empire, *as to other seats of Christian culture.*' ('Der Dom zu Aachen,' pp. 6, 42, 52.)

We have italicised the concluding words because we believe that it is just on these lines that we have to look for an explanation of those characteristics of Irish civilisation to which we have above referred. Attention has often been drawn to the Litany of Aengus the Culdee, written about 800 A.D., as furnishing direct and indisputable evidence of the presence in Ireland of crowds of Orientals, including seven Egyptian monks buried at

Disert Ulidh. We recall Ussher's astonishment at discovering that the Irish monk and geometer, Vergil (Fergil), afterwards first Bishop of Salzburg, was accompanied thither from Ireland by a Greek. But we need use only the evidence of our own eyes to convince us that Ireland, from the seventh to the ninth century, and perhaps even later, was saturated with eastern learning and art. We shudder, remembering to what accidents we owe the preservation of such costly treasures as the Tara brooch, the Ardagh chalice, the cross of Cong, the 'Book of Kells,' and Cormac's chapel, to think how many beautiful works of art have perished through time, mischance, and the hand of the barbarian. But enough remains to show us that, if we are ever to appreciate the real significance of the golden age of Irish civilisation, we have to go, not to Rome or even Constantinople, but to Asia Minor, to Syria and Egypt. We repeat that we are far from wishing to disparage the learning and skill of Irish scholars and artists. They were excellent pupils. How successfully they could copy, the cross of Cong shows us; but they invented nothing themselves. An exotic plant from the beginning, the stream that nourished it no sooner began to dry up than Irish civilisation and culture drooped and died.

From what we have said it will be understood that we do not regard the Danish invasions as directly responsible for the decay of learning and art in Ireland. Indeed, with the cross of Cong (1123) and Cormac's chapel (dedicated in 1134), we have long passed beyond the Danish period. On the contrary, we think it can be shown that in some respects the Danish invasions tended to promote the cause of Irish civilisation. We do not allude to the fact that the round towers owe their origin to the necessity under which Irish ecclesiastics lay of providing a place of shelter for themselves and their treasures against the marauding Danes—and we may add, against the attacks of hostile native tribes; and that an impulse was thereby given to the art of building in stone and to the transition from wooden to stone churches—but rather to the political influence exerted by the Danes after they had effected a settlement in the island, as furnishing a chance of substituting the idea of national unity for the narrower one of the tribe.

We have said that Ireland has fully justified her claim to the title of 'Island of the Saints'; but this is far from saying that Ireland was what we should call a Christian country. Indeed we have every reason to believe that the progress of Christianity was extremely slow and erratic. This was a natural consequence of the tribal system and the absence of any central authority. In religion, as in other matters, each chief did as seemed good in his own eyes; with the result that, while undisturbed by foreign invasions, Ireland was seldom at peace within her own borders. Father D'Alton, whose merits as a historical student compel us to regret his having undertaken such a thankless and superfluous work as a history of Ireland in more than one volume, gives himself no illusions on the subject

'Untroubled' (he writes) 'by either Frank or Saxon, Ireland was allowed to pursue its destiny in peace; and yet it is only the truth to say that, from the sixth to the ninth century, its record was one of turbulence and blood. A crowd of chieftains or petty kings, careless of the national welfare and intent only on preserving the lawless independence of their clans, were for ever contending with each other. In the Brehon Law it is stated that he is no king who has not hostages; and these were usually had by war. The more of these hostages a king or a chief had, the greater was he acknowledged to be; he regarded their number with as much complacency as the Red Indian regarded the number of scalps that hung at his belt. . . . Of the twelve kings who ruled in the sixth century, all but two were murdered or fell in battle, and their successors in the two following centuries were pursued with similar misfortune' (p. 73).

And yet, we repeat, this was the golden age of the Irish Church and of Irish culture—the age when Ireland was flooding Europe with her saints and scholars and producing works of art which are our astonishment to-day. All that it proves is that a high state of culture is compatible with intestine disturbance. But we must not exaggerate either the one or the other. The culture we have spoken of was the possession only of the few, and left the bulk of the people untouched; while, so far as internal dissension went, the Irish were no worse than their Anglo-Saxon neighbours. At the same time it shows that we must not regard the Danish invasions as

a merely destructive element. England was exposed to them just as much as Ireland; and yet England emerged a united nation, whereas Ireland remained what she had always been, a mere congeries of warring tribes. It was external pressure that moulded England into one homogeneous whole. But in her West-Saxon sovereigns, from Egberht to Eadred, she possessed for a century and a half a race of rulers such as it was never Ireland's good fortune to have. Herein lay the difference, and not in any supposed racial superiority. At Clontarf, Brian Boroinhe destroyed the Danish power more effectually than ever it was destroyed in England. But he died in the hour of victory, and there was no one to continue the work he had begun. The danger past, Ireland fell back into her old distracted state. The opportunity of building up a strong homogeneous kingdom under one powerful native sovereign was lost; and it never recurred.

But the Danes left their mark on the country. To them Ireland owes the beginnings of its municipal life. Dublin, Waterford, and Limerick trace their origin to the pirates of the north. Still, their influence never spread to the country at large; and, when the Anglo-Normans came, Ireland fell an easy prey. Unfortunately it was not with a united country that the new invaders had to deal. On the one side there was no resistance worth speaking of; on the other, no conquest complete and final, as that of England had been. The invaders were simply absorbed by the invaded, to become in time more Irish than the Irish themselves. But there is no question that, where they settled, they introduced the elements of a more perfectly developed civilisation. As we have said, Irish learning and art survived almost into Anglo-Norman times, but they were dying of inanition. Further development on the old lines was impossible. It was political organisation that Ireland lacked. The pity was that the invaders were not strong enough everywhere to enforce their political ideas on the mass of the people. Where they did so, there a young and vigorous civilisation sprang up, to which justice has never been fully done.

ROBERT DUNLOP.

Art. V.—NORTHUMBERLAND.

A History of Northumberland. Issued under the direction of the Northumberland County History Committee. Vols I-VII. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Reid, 1893-1904.

It is a real delight to meet with a book conceived on the scale and carried out with the leisurely care of this history of Northumberland. Industrialism, luxury, and the growth of population are rapidly wiping out the traces of the past in our country. It is a matter of pressing importance that the local historian and archæologist should diligently record what remains, as well as do his utmost to stay the hand of the destroyer.

In no other part of England can the history of the past be so well read on the face of the country as in Northumberland. Few other counties have won, as it has done, the love of those who dwell in it. As its history carries us back to the sources of our civilisation, so do the character of its people, the subtle charm of its wild scenery, the life-giving freshness of its sweeping winds, seem to carry us back to the realities of things, to the consideration of the real forces of nature, of the real power of man. But Northumberland has waited long for its complete county history. The present great work is a continuation, not a beginning; it only carries on the undertaking begun by John Hodgson, of whose history of Northumberland it has been said that, 'for excellence of design and completeness of execution, it is a model of what a county history should be.'

John Hodgson was not himself a Northumbrian. Born in 1779, he was the son of a stone-mason in Westmoreland. The grammar-school at Brampton made it possible even for a stone-mason's son to obtain that good education which the northern working-folk were keen to secure for at least one member of a family. But there was no means of sending young Hodgson to the university; and at the age of twenty he had to begin to earn his livelihood as a village schoolmaster. A few years afterwards, he refused a tempting offer to enter a business career, saying that he wished 'to pursue a literary rather than a mercantile life'; and, finally, he took orders. In his first parish at Lanchester, near Durham, a fine Roman camp

kindled in him an enthusiasm for the study of Roman antiquities. His historical sense was still further gratified when, on being presented to the living of Jarrow, he could feel that he was building on foundations laid by Benedict Biscop and Bede. He seized opportunities to travel about Northumberland and to write on what he observed, and in 1813 he aided in the foundation of a Society of Antiquaries in Newcastle. Slowly there grew up in his mind the thought of the great work of his life, the history of Northumberland. In 1817 he announced his plans and asked for subscribers to his book.

He proposed to divide the history into three parts: the first to consist of a general history of the county, the second of topography and local antiquities arranged under parishes, the third of a collection of records and illustrative documents. He began with the publication of documents, 'ancient records and historical papers,' thus laying a sure foundation for his later work. In his preface he writes: 'That the contents of this volume in their present form are of a dry and unamusing kind is readily admitted. But, while they fail to entertain, I expect they will be considered as free from the attribute of offending.' He is confident that, by the inferences he will be able to draw from them, he will 'rescue them from the character of dullness.' He goes on to speak of the 'magnitude of his undertaking, pursued, not under the influences of ease and uninterrupted leisure, but under the laborious avocations of a minister in a very extensive and populous parish, and of a father and tutor in a numerous family.' He did not spare himself in his efforts to make his book complete, and with his own hands he cut facsimiles of seals and vignettes in wood to illustrate it.

A gift of 200*l.* from Dr Shute Barrington, Bishop of Durham, made the continuance of his work possible. But it grew before him; and, when he issued the second volume, he stated that experience had shown him the impossibility of completing it within the limits he had set himself. He realised that he could hope for no remuneration for his own labours in the prosecution of such a work, but he was content to go on if he could get sufficient patronage and not suffer loss. He justified the detailed nature of his work by saying, with profound truth, 'How much of the elements of geography, of

statistics, of the general and natural history of a country, and especially of the real history of the human race . . . is to be found in parochial history.' But he spoke with the utmost humility of his task, saying that he knew that that species of literature to which he has devoted his attention could not 'be ranked high in the scale of letters.' Yet no man discerned better the real value of such work. He wrote in his preface:—

'What man is there who, when he hears the place of his birth and the hills and lands of his forefathers made the subjects of these various histories and enquiries, does not glory in them and feel a love and veneration for them far above aught that the dull and incurious people can imagine, who have no such recitals about the places in which they were born or the fields that nurtured them? What is it but this rational and virtuous pride for one's country, which is the flame and soul of patriotism.'

A delay in the appearance of the third volume is explained by the fact that 'his leisure hours were wholly occupied in procuring means for rebuilding the chapel of Heworth, and in seeing it carried out.' In 1823 Bishop Barrington gave him the county living of Kirk Whelpington, in the centre of Northumberland; and later he was appointed to the parish of Hartburn, where he received a better income, which gave him more facilities for proceeding with his work. In the preface to the volume published in 1827 he says that 'few days during the past seven years have passed by without finding me engaged in some research connected with the subject of this work'; but he owns that

'the thirst for collecting materials for works of this kind is often stronger than the resolution to begin to put them into proper historical form. . . . The antiquary often digs up more of the crude ore of the history of former ages in the zeal of early life, than the study and contemplation of riper years . . . can fuse and form into useful or ornamental or curious literature.'

It is not surprising that when, after several years of suffering, he died in 1845, he should have left his great book unfinished. The work had been a constant source of joy to him, and he had been much cheered by the help

alike in money, sympathy, and literary assistance, given him by many friends and fellow-students. But, though his task was a labour of love, the growing sense of its magnitude was sometimes almost overwhelming. Such a work, he wrote, should be undertaken by some one rich and childless. 'I rise to this labour every morning with increasing desire to complete it. It keeps in delightful employment a mind that finds it as impossible to be idle as to be soured by disappointment or insensible to encouragement.' He left behind him a hundred manuscript volumes of documents and other material for the completion of the history.

A book such as his could not be expected to have a wide or immediate success. But other antiquaries and historians recognised its value and were inspired by it to further work. The Antiquarian Society of Newcastle-on-Tyne commissioned Mr John Hodgson-Hinde to write the volume containing a general history of the county, which Hodgson had projected but never composed. This appeared in 1858; but the parochial history remained unfinished. Dr J. C. Bruce and Mr John Clayton did important work on the history of the Roman Wall; and others, too numerous to be mentioned, worked at local histories and points of detail, till, in the minds of those who had loved their county, a scheme was formed to complete 'that great history of Northumberland, monumental alike in its conception and execution, which Mr Hodgson was unable to finish in his lifetime.' Under the guidance of Dr Thomas Hodgkin, the distinguished historian, long a resident in Northumberland, and a lover if not a native of the county, a committee was formed for this purpose in 1890. Liberal help, both in money and work, has been forthcoming; and Hodgson's grandson has entrusted to the committee all the material which he had accumulated.

The first volume of the new history appeared in 1893. The idea was to complete, if possible, in twelve volumes, the parochial history, 'to be supplemented at some future time, if practicable, by a volume in which the fruits of minute research will be summarised and tabulated.' But the committee seem likely to find, as Mr Hodgson did, that they will not be able to complete their undertaking within the limits which they have set themselves. Seven

volumes have now appeared; and much of the county still remains to be treated. Three different editors have in turn undertaken the volumes which have already been published; and the majority of the committee have helped in one way or another, some by much active work, in their production. It is inevitable that a book composed in this way should lack the individual note which gives a special charm to Hodgson's volumes. On the other hand, it stands as a noble monument of the patriotism of a band of men all distinguished, in various ways, for services to their county.

It was in 1895 that the last living link between the original work of Hodgson and the present history disappeared. The death of Mr William Woodman of Morpeth is mentioned in the third volume of the new issue; sixty years earlier, in the preface to his second volume, Hodgson had spoken of the help received from Mr Woodman. During all this period Mr Woodman, a devoted antiquary and, through his position as a solicitor, intimately acquainted with the history of many Northumbrian families, had accumulated material illustrative of the history of his county. Time had failed him to make use of this material. When an old man he made acquaintance with Dr Creighton, and hoped that his collections might be used by him. Dr Creighton wrote to a friend from Embleton vicarage in 1884:—

'An old solicitor, aged eighty-one, puts his papers of a lifetime into my hands. If I don't use them, they will be lost. Though I can only use them inadequately, yet I may kindle others to investigate what will soon be past investigation.'

Dr Creighton's own investigations fired him with a desire to write a history of the Border, a work which he hoped to undertake when his 'History of the Papacy' was finished. When circumstances made this impossible, he lent his aid, as well as Mr Woodman's materials, to the committee which is producing the present history.

The work itself, and the way in which its production has been assisted and supported, form a strong testimony to the fascination which Northumberland exercises over those who know it. It would be going too far to say that a book of this kind can do much, if anything, to reveal the secret of that fascination. We hope that it may enter

into the plans of the committee to issue, not only a final volume, in which 'the fruits of minute research will be summarised and tabulated,' but also to entrust to some historian, able to make his subject live, the writing of a volume which may make known to the general reader the historical significance of the records here brought together. A county history is bound to be a mine from which the student may extract the material he needs, rather than a book for the reader to enjoy. But we ask ourselves whether, in a work which is allowed to wander on with such a delightful sense of space and leisure, a little more room for points of human interest might not have been found. We welcome the rare extracts from Archdeacon Singleton's minute-book, with his shrewd remarks on the clergy and the condition of their parishes in 1828. We do not know whether it is done purposely, but it seems a pity that no attempt should be made to explain the origin of many of the quaint names of townships that survive in Northumberland, such as Spindlestone, Glowrorum, Blowearie, Canada, etc. We hope also that in some future volume the interesting questions connected with land tenure that are illustrated by the history and records of Northumberland may be taken up. Dr Creighton wrote in 1884:—

'I think that I am on the track of discovering survivals up to the beginning of the century in Northumberland of *free* village communities, scarcely touched by the manorial system.'

The material collected for this history should make it easy to investigate this and other kindred points.

It may be truly said that there is little in the history of the growth of our civilisation upon which light may not be thrown by a study of Northumberland. We are carried far back into the mysterious past by the strange markings of the inscribed stones which lie strewn amongst the heather upon many of the high and desolate moors. These rude incisions, strange groupings of concentric circles, made by stone implements upon sandstone rocks, have been explained in various ways. One thing only is certain, that they carry us back before the days of bronze, far back before the coming of the Celts, as do also some of the barrows and hut circles on the moors. History speaks more clearly in the British camps, which show how

the sturdy tribes of the north resisted the coming of the Roman, whose rule meant to them forced conscription and the tax-gatherer. We find their traces on the hill-tops, so situated that signals could be seen from one camp to another; and on the hills facing them may be found remains of the camps of the invading Romans.

But mightiest of all the silent teachers of history that our land possesses is that great monument both of the power of Rome and of the resource and courage of the peoples she wished to subdue—the stupendous wall which, with its vallum, its fosse, its camps, its castles, its sentry-boxes, formed one continuous line of guarded and patrolled fortifications from the Tyne to the Solway. The description of the remains of the Roman Wall is contained in the last of Hodgson's volumes. He seemed to have clearly established the claim of Hadrian to be considered the builder of the wall, a view in which Dr Bruce and Mr Clayton agreed. Later scholars have come to doubt this conclusion, but have, as a rule, abstained from starting any definite theory in its place. The interest of the wall and the lessons it teaches do not, however, depend upon the name of its builder. Time has not been able to efface these lessons, even though for centuries the wall has been used as a quarry by the dwellers in its neighbourhood. Stones which bear the mark of the Roman chisel are built into the walls of farmhouses and barns; many more have been broken up to mend the roads. Still, enough remains to show us the nature of the fortification and the way in which the garrison, computed by Dr Bruce at over ten thousand men, lived along its line. Then, all across the now desolate moors, the whole extent of seventy-three miles was patrolled day and night by sentinels. Should an attack be threatened at any point, they could in a moment pass along the signal to the larger bodies of men gathered in the mile castles, and from thence, if necessary, to one of the stations or permanent fortified camps.

In those days, the district which surrounded the wall and was intersected by the great roads which marked everywhere the advance of the Roman armies, must have been busy with the coming and going of the traders needed to supply the wants of a large army. Now, except at the two ends, the line of the wall passes through a very thinly populated region. The most complete remains are

to be found where the wall skirts a basalt ridge near the Northumbrian lakes, between Chesters and Gilsland. At present only a lonely farmhouse here and there breaks the solitude; and sheep graze on the grassy moor once occupied with the busy life of a Roman station. The most solitary of the stations on the wall, Borcovicus, is, in consequence, the most perfect. The opposite hill is dotted with the remains of the comfortable villas built for the chief officers of the garrison. In the splendid museum at Chesters, which contains the antiquities so indefatigably collected by Mr Clayton, as well as in the British Museum, in the museums at Carlisle and Newcastle and elsewhere, and in the collections of the Duke of Northumberland and others, we can study the manner of life of the Roman dwellers in the north. The ornaments, the utensils, the sculptures, the plans of the buildings which have been discovered, show that cultivated men and women tried, in this cold and desolate region, to make homes for themselves which might remind them of the civilisation they had left behind. From the days when the Romans, sore pressed at home, were forced to give up this distant outpost, the line of the wall has lain desolate. Even the military road running along by its southern flank was destroyed; and for centuries nothing took its place. In 1745 General Wade, owing to the bad state of the roads, could not drag his guns from Hexham to Carlisle to aid in the defence of the city against the Pretender. He determined to prevent the recurrence of such difficulties, and ordered a road to be made between Newcastle and Carlisle. This was the first attempt to restore in some faint degree the civilised conditions which had prevailed under Roman rule.

Once again, after the days of the Romans, Northumberland may be said to have been the most important centre of government in England. The first volume of the new issue of the history tells us the story of that great building, which must rank second in importance in the county to the Roman Wall, the Castle of Bamborough. The coast of Northumberland is fringed with sandhills, held together in some places by the bent grass, grey against the blue sea, and in others, where rock has mingled with the sand, carpeted with soft grass and flowers. But here and there along the coast the basalt,

the presence of which at intervals all over the county is one of its most striking geological features, crops out. Sometimes it appears as a great cliff or point of rock running out into the sea; sometimes as a 'heugh,' as the long ridges of rock are called, which, sloping on the sea side, drop down suddenly far inland in a perpendicular cliff; sometimes in loose masses of rock strewn upon the shore, as if they had been poured forth molten from the cauldron of a volcano. At Bamborough a solitary cliff, its perpendicular side facing inland, rises suddenly in a wide stretch of sand. It is a site which seems to compel a castle; and here in 547 Ida, king of the scattered tribes of the Angles who, after years spent in plundering, were being transformed into permanent settlers, planted his standard and enclosed his settlement first with a hedge and afterwards with a wall. All along the coast and up the river valleys the 'tons' and the 'hams' in the name-terminations mark the completeness of the English conquest. No part of England is more truly English than Northumberland. Untouched in later years by the invasions of the Danes, who settled in Durham and Yorkshire, too remote to be much influenced by the Normans, the Northumbrians are for the most part pure Angles; and their dialect is one of the purest and richest forms of the English tongue.

The stronghold of the Northumbrian kings, the greatest rulers of their day in England, was called Bebbanburh or Bamborough, after Bebb, Queen of Ethelfrith, Ida's grandson. It was the royal city, a centre of beneficent influence for the north. As we look out from the castle rock, we are reminded on every side of the old greatness of the Northumbrian kingdom. To the north the sands of Budle Bay, the haunt of the curlew and the plover and of countless sea-birds, stretch out towards the flat sandy reach of Lindisfarne or Holy Island, where Aidan, summoned from Iona by Oswald to teach his people, set up his bishop's stool. Straight in front, purple-black amongst the waves, lie the scattered Farne Islands, where St Cuthbert, wearied with his labours, sought peace for his soul. We do not wonder when we see the rocky sides of the islands, densely covered with the myriads of sea-birds that gather there to breed, and our ears are deafened with their dis-

cordant cries, that the fancy of the time peopled the islands with evil spirits, and that St Cuthbert found it hard to save the crops which he tried to raise. The legend tells us that he remonstrated with the birds for the damage that they wrought, after which they flew away and never returned to pilfer. To the west of the castle of Bamborough, beyond the tiny village, lies the church called by St Aidan's name, and probably founded by him. The existing church, built in the twelfth century, is one of the largest and finest in the county. Besides the castle and the church and a few bits of old wall built into farm-buildings here and there, nothing remains to tell of the former importance of Bamborough.

Bamborough remained a royal castle even after the Norman conquest, when the glorious days of the northern kingdom were followed by a long agony. The Northumbrian desire for independence was punished by the terrible harrying of William I; and the land from the Humber to the Tees was laid waste. The mighty Norman keep which frowns so strangely down on the encircling railways of the modern Newcastle, speaks of the determination of the Norman kings to make their power felt in the north. The desolation of the county consequent on William's harrying is probably one of the reasons why it was not included in the Domesday survey—a fact which adds to the difficulty of investigating its early conditions. Wide lands were granted to Norman barons; and the Vesci, lords of Alnwick, founded a second Norman town round the walls of their castle on the Aln.

With the Norman barons came the monastic orders; and they at least did something for the well-being of the people. They found sheltered and fertile sites for their houses in the deep, wooded valleys, through which the little rivers of Northumberland make their way from the moors to the sea. Few things are more unexpected in Northumbrian scenery than these river valleys. The open undulating county of field or moor seems to stretch away unbroken and almost treeless to the blue line of the Cheviots and the high moors. But suddenly we may come upon a deep gorge, its sides covered with fine trees and rich undergrowth, at the bottom of which the brown waters of a peaty stream sing amongst the stones. In such spots as these the Carmelites, the Black and White

Friars, and other orders, found shelter not only from the wild northern winds, but even, so safely were they hidden amongst the trees, from the devastating bands of the Scottish raiders. Of Blanchland Abbey, in its beautiful seclusion on the Derwent, little is left; but the grey ruins of Hulne Abbey in Alnwick Park, and the beautiful abbey church of Brinkburn on the Coquet, as well as the noble ruins of Tynemouth and the abbey on Holy Island, remain to show that here, too, the skill of the monastic builder did not fail. Finest of all, the great abbey which the Augustinian canons raised on the site of Wilfrid's church still dominates the little town of Hexham. Of the many chapels built to serve the needs of the scattered population, few traces remain; but the fact that they existed shows that something must have been done for the comfort and the teaching of the people.

Clergy and people alike were in constant danger from the raids of the Scots. Again and again the old records tell us of parishes devastated and utterly destroyed, or laid waste with fire and sword. These raids led to the erection of the strong towers called 'peels,' which form one of the most interesting features of the Border. No certain explanation can be given of the name 'peel,' but it seems likely that it has the same origin as 'pile.' The peel was a tower sufficiently strong to afford shelter from a passing raid. When the signal was passed on from one watcher to another, the men with their cattle and their few possessions of value had the right to take refuge within the walls of the neighbouring peel. The peel-towers or their ruins are scattered all over the face of the county, and are as a rule fine masses of well-built masonry. Sometimes, as at Rothbury and Embleton, they form part of the vicarage house; sometimes, as at Longhoughton and Bywell, they serve as towers to the parish church. In other cases they are built into farm or manor-house, or are left standing as solitary ruins.

The inhabitants of the parish of Bamborough had the right to store their goods for safety within the walls of the castle, and would at times carry there even the beams of their houses, an interesting testimony to the scarcity of wood in a country which was always being burnt and harried. The lord who held the castle for the king was apt to charge exorbitant fees for this shelter;

and the people had, moreover, to pay a second time to the porters and servants for permission to take their goods out again. There were times when the raids of the Scots made it absolutely unsafe for any one to live outside the castle walls. So, even though Bamborough was a royal castle, visited once or twice at least by kings and queens, and though the town of Bamborough received charters and privileges, and in 1295 was one of the three places in Northumberland bidden to send two members to Edward I's model parliament, it is not wonderful that its population was never large. In the thirteenth century probably about two hundred people were living within the borough boundaries.

As we look southwards from the rock of Bamborough, the jagged towers of the lonely ruin of Dunstanborough can be seen rising above the black line of its basalt cliff. Probably from prehistoric times this strange cliff, with its sweeping line of basalt columns dropping straight into the sea, had been fortified; but we hear of no Norman castle there. As part of the barony of Embleton, it came by exchange for some lands in the south into the hands of Simon de Montfort, and after him passed to Edmund, Earl of Lancaster. Thomas of Lancaster planned a mighty castle there; but, before it could be finished and used as he intended, as a strong place in his rebellion against Edward II, he was executed at Pontefract, and Dunstanborough became a royal castle. Later it passed to John of Gaunt, who took a personal interest in its fortification; and then, with the duchy of Lancaster, it became a royal possession at the accession of Henry IV. So it was that, in their struggle with the house of York, the Lancastrians hoped to find many friends to help them in this district. Margaret of Anjou held the three castles of Bamborough, Dunstanborough, and Alnwick; and many stories, some true and some, no doubt, legendary, are told of her adventures in Northumberland.

The greatness of the two castles by the sea perished with the cause of Henry VI. Dunstanborough, held first by one side, then by the other, had to suffer many sieges. For some years after the conclusion of peace, constables were still appointed for it; but, when it was no longer needed as a fortress, it quickly fell into decay. Wolsey gave permission that the lead from Dunstan-

borough castle should be taken to repair the roof of the donjon at Wark; and in a report to Henry VIII in 1538 it was described as 'a very ruinous house and of small strength.' But its stones and its timbers, as well as the lead on its roof, were still of value; and these seem to have been used as a quarry for buildings in the neighbourhood. It is a striking testimony to the wonderful strength of the masonry erected by Thomas of Lancaster that the great gatehouse and the fine tower on the northern side of the castle, together with much of the curtain wall, should still be standing.

The great days of Dunstanborough castle were few and troubled, but the loneliness of its site has gifted it with an immortal beauty. No road leads to it, and the only approach is by a track over the links from Embleton, or along the fields above the rock-bound coast between the castle and the tiny fishing village of Craster. It lies on a peninsula of rock stretching out into the sea, whose waves break with vain force upon the hard surface of the basalt. Ten acres of grass are enclosed within the castle walls, and here a few sheep graze; but otherwise all is desolation. There are days when the sea under the north-east wind rivals the Mediterranean in the brilliancy of its blues, and the sun shining on the basalt brings out strange tints of purple and red, whilst the greys of the weather-beaten walls and towers are soft and warm against the clear sky, and the cliffs are gay with the sea-pinks. But it is perhaps when the north-west wind is sweeping up the clouds, and cliff and rocks are black against the silver sea, with its soft sudden gleams under the driving clouds, and the waves dash themselves with a great roar in mountains of white foam upon the rocks, that the peculiar fascination of Dunstanborough makes itself most truly felt. Turner and many other artists have painted it; but its secret is still its own, revealed only to the patient love of those who watch it in all its moods. We must earnestly hope that those into whose hands the possession of this unique spot has passed, as part of a great landed estate, will realise their responsibility to preserve unharmed and undesecrated one of the most splendid heritages of the past.

Bamborough, beautiful as it must always be, would perhaps have had still greater charm had it shared the

desolation of Dunstanborough. It had been besieged by Warwick and shot at by the king's great guns till 'the stones of the wall flew into the sea.' Small wonder that in 1538 the constable wrote that the castle 'is sore in ruine and in such decaye that in all the sayd chastell there is neyther lodgyng for man or horse.' In spite of repeated suggestions and even orders for restoration, nothing was done; and in 1610 James I gave the castle to one of the Forsters, the great landowners of the neighbourhood, who had bought the estates of the Austin canons at Bamborough at the dissolution. In 1704 the Forsters had to sell their lands to pay their debts; and their estates were bought by Lord Crewe, Bishop of Durham. At his death he left the greater part of his property to trustees for charitable purposes. The royal castle on the rock of Bamborough became a charitable institution; and, though the mighty keep was left comparatively untouched, the ruins of the great hall and other buildings were converted into a charity school. Since then the castle has undergone another transformation, for it has been bought by Lord Armstrong and converted into a modern dwelling-house. Nature herself has interfered somewhat with the grandeur of the site, for the winds and waves have driven the sand over much of the rock and the ruined walls on the seaward side. Nevertheless, the site, the massive lines of the keep, the outlook over the sea to Lindisfarne and the Farne Islands will always recall the departed glories of the royal city of Northumberland.

The two other chief Northumbrian castles, Alnwick and Warkworth, are connected with the name of one of the most famous of Northumbrian families, the Percies. The story of Warkworth, which was granted to the Percies by Edward III in 1328, is narrated in the fifth volume of the history; that of Alnwick still remains to be told. The fact that Alnwick has been restored as the dwelling-place of the Dukes of Northumberland makes Warkworth the more interesting of the two to the student of the past. The generosity of the present duke has enriched the history with numerous pictures which enable the reader to gain some idea of the rare interest of the castle and the little town. Warkworth possesses everything that the soul of the archæologist

could desire. The brown waters of the Coquet are spanned by a fourteenth century stone bridge of beautiful shape which ends in a gatehouse, and through this we pass into the steep street of the little grey town which mounts up to the castle. Close to the bridge lies the Norman church, with its long, narrow nave and its small round-headed Norman windows. A nameless stone crusader, clothed in early fourteenth century armour, sleeps within its walls.

The castle on its mound, girt on three sides by the Coquet, does not frown down upon the town like a stern master. The grace and beauty of its architecture seem rather to suggest the kind friend at whose feet the little houses have clustered for safety. It is a ruin, but a ruin which preserves so much of its architectural beauty, as well as of its internal arrangements, that it teaches us more perhaps than any other building in England about the nature of an Edwardian castle. The donjon is the most elaborately planned tower-house in existence. Viollet-le-Duc adapted its plans for his ideal country-house. It is an intricate maze of chambers and passages, the masterpiece of a great architect, with features of rare beauty; but we do not know who built it, or even when it was built. The mighty cellars show the space necessary to contain the stores of provisions for a great household in the past. The large prisons suggest the need of ample accommodation for the numerous captives of Border warfare.

Standing apart from the donjon are the ruins of the great hall, its tower ornamented with the Percy emblem, the lion; and near it are the foundations of a large chapel running right across the castle enclosure, a work begun in days of splendour, and probably never completed. Already, when James I passed through Warkworth in 1617 on one of his journeys to Scotland, the castle was in a miserable condition. The Earl of Northumberland had been concerned in the Guy Fawkes plot; and, to meet the heavy fine imposed upon him, he was reduced to selling the lead from the roofs of the ruinous part of the castle. After this it seems never to have been regularly inhabited. Cromwell had a garrison there in 1648; and the treatment of his rough soldiery was not likely to improve its condition. Finally, in 1672, the widow of the

last earl of the house of Louvain gave away to a certain John Clarke the materials of the castle. A long train of 272 waggons, furnished on compulsion by the tenants in the neighbourhood, carried away lead, timber, and 'such other materials as shall be fit to be removed.' The later members of the house of Northumberland have respected the beauty of their ruined castle, and have even at times thought of restoring it as a dwelling-house. We are grateful that it has been left as it is, to teach the student so many secrets about the domestic life and the artistic feeling of the Middle Ages.

The Coquet, a stream dear to the fisherman, which winds round the castle mound, is one of the fairest of Northumbrian rivers. Not only are its wooded banks adorned by the castle of Warkworth and the great abbey of Brinkburn, but within a cliff a few hundred yards above Warkworth castle lies a building which forms one of the most fascinating treasures of Northumberland. No record tells who was the hermit who made for himself such a beautiful retreat. At first it seems to have been rough-hewn out of the solid rock; it was afterwards ornamented with pillars and vaulting. A window with rich tracery has been cut in the wall which divides the inner from the outer chapel. By the side of the stone altar, the only one in Northumberland which was not overthrown or defaced during the religious troubles of the sixteenth century, is the recumbent figure of a woman with a man kneeling at her feet; and between them is the head of a bull. There is no certain tradition to explain the significance of these figures. Bishop Percy, in his ballad, 'The Hermit of Warkworth,' has told a romantic story, which people have been glad to accept in the absence of any truthful record; but it has no foundation in fact. Amongst the Northumbrian papers there are records, so late as 1531, of the names of persons to whom the hermitage was granted. It is described in 1537 as 'a verey propre howse, buylded out of a rocke of stone, with many comodities thereto belongynge.' In all England no hermitage can compare with it in charm and interest, except perhaps that in Guy's Cliff, near Warwick, now also a possession of the Percy family.

The castles of which we have spoken are amongst the most famous in Northumberland, but there are many

others. Some, like Houghton and Chipchase on the beautiful reaches of the North Tyne, and Chillingham, famous for its wild cattle, lying below the heather-covered hill of Ross Castle, which towers over the surrounding moors, a landmark for many miles, have been transformed into commodious dwelling-houses. Many gaunt ruins, like Prudhoe, Twizel, and Norham, have little more than their walls left standing.

The county houses in Northumberland are few and scattered. In the great days of our Renaissance there was nothing to induce the gentry to build themselves fine Tudor houses amidst the moors and woods made desolate by the long Border warfare. Record after record speaks of the raids of the borderers, and of the means, generally insufficient, taken to prevent them. There seems to have been a period between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries, when the rule of the Norman barons and the civilising influences of the monastic orders brought some brief prosperity to Northumberland. But the Scottish wars of Edward I meant ruin to the Border. The county is described in 1318 as wasted and wholly destroyed. The Lord Warden of the Marches, whose office was established by Edward I, had a difficult task to discover some means to protect the wretched population. It was then that the peel-towers were, for the most part, built. The barbarous condition of the county can best be judged by the description published in his Commentaries by Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, afterwards Pope Pius II, of his journey through Northumberland to London from Edinburgh, whither he had been sent on a secret mission to the Scottish king. Travelling in the disguise of a merchant, he describes how, after crossing the Tweed in a boat,

‘he turned aside towards sunset to a large manor and alighted at the farmhouse. There he had supper with his host and the priest of the place. Many victuals and fowls and geese were brought in, but there was neither wine nor bread. Then all the women flocked together from all sides to the manor as if for a strange spectacle; and as our countrymen are wont to wonder at the Ethiopians or Indians, so they gazed in amazement at Æneas, inquiring from the priest to what country he belonged, what he had come to do, and whether he knew the Christian faith. But Æneas, knowing the scarcity

that he would meet with on the journey, had procured at a monastery some loaves and a barrel of red wine; and, when these were brought, still greater wonder possessed the natives, who had seen neither wine nor white bread. . . . When supper had been prolonged to the second hour of the night, the priest and his host took leave of Æneas and hastened to depart with the children and the men. They said they were fleeing to a tower a long distance off, in fear of the Scots, who, when the river grew shallower as the tide ebbed, were in the habit of crossing over and plundering. And though Æneas besought them with many entreaties, they refused to take him with them on any consideration; nor did they take any of the women with them, although there were girls and several comely women, for these they thought would suffer no wrong at the hands of the enemy ("qui stuprum inter mala non ducunt"). So Æneas remained there alone with his two servants and one guide, amidst a hundred women who made a ring round the fire, and they spent the night without sleep, chatting with the interpreter, and cleaning hemp. After midnight the dogs began to bark and the geese to cackle, and a huge noise arose; and then all the women rushed headlong in different directions. The guide also fled, and the whole place was full of uproar as if the enemy were upon them. . . . Almost immediately the women returned with the interpreter and announced that there was no danger, for that it was friends, not enemies, who had come. When day broke Æneas ventured to continue his journey, and arrived at Newcastle. . . . There, for the first time, he seemed to recognise the world again, and a land that looked as if men could live in it.'

Æneas found Northumberland 'uninhabitable, horrible, uncultivated.' It was long before there was much improvement. It is true that a special code of laws had grown up for the Borders, which were administered by Wardens of the Marches, appointed for each side of the Border by the English and Scottish kings respectively. But it was only now and then that the wardens were men of a kind to administer these laws with justice and severity. In the upland villages of Liddesdale, Tynedale, and Redesdale, districts which even in these days are wild and desolate enough, lived a lawless race of moss-troopers, constantly engaged in Border-raids.

Amongst the brutal acts done by Henry VIII, none was more brutal than the cold-blooded way in which he

used the border-raids as a means of weakening the Scottish power. James IV of Scotland had invaded England with an army of forty thousand men whilst Henry VIII was away in France. But the Earl of Surrey hastily gathered an army together and marched into Northumberland and attacked the Scots, who lay encamped on the hill of Flodden between the Twizel and the Till. In the battle which followed, James IV was killed and his army scattered; but Surrey was too weak to pursue his advantage. Then, since a regular invasion of Scotland was impossible, Henry VIII bade Thomas, Lord Dacre, the Warden of the Marches, lay waste the Scottish Border; and the command was fulfilled with the utmost thoroughness. Dacre writes that land for 630 ploughs 'lies all and every one of them waste now, and no corn sown upon none of the said grounds.' During his stern rule the English side was at least in comparative peace. We are told that 'for the last few years not more than eighty cottages had been burnt in these marches, and that for one taken by the Scots he has taken a hundred, for one sheep, two hundred.' It is no wonder that, whenever and wherever vigilance relaxed, the Scots took their revenge.

The destruction wrought is incredible. Monasteries, villages, castles, and market-towns were destroyed; and things only began to improve when, under Elizabeth, peace was made between England and Scotland. During her efficient administration the wardenship of the English Marches was given to capable officials, who revived and put in force the old Border-laws. The country was mapped out into wardships; the townships were obliged to keep the watches at fords and mountain-passes by day and night. An elaborate system of beacons passed on the alarm of a raid from one peel-tower to another; blood-hounds were kept to pursue fugitives. But it took long years for the spirit of unrest to die out; and, in the first Stewart rising against the Hanoverians, it was not difficult to find men to come out at the bidding of Mr Forster of Bamborough and the luckless Lord Derwentwater, to fight for the cause of James III. Wandering bodies of moss-troopers still lived amongst the Cheviots and along the river valleys; and their roving, thieving habits died hard. Their sturdy vigour,

and their great powers of endurance, as well as something of their roughness, may still be seen in their descendants; but the lonely traveller can wander amongst the wildest valleys and most desolate moors of Northumberland in perfect safety and complete reliance upon the honesty and real kindness of the peasantry.

The old names still linger, but there is nothing to tell that the townships which survive, and are recognised as poor-law parishes even when they consist only of a single farm, were once inhabited by sturdy freeholders. The fortunes of these families of freeholders may be traced in many genealogies given in the 'History of Northumberland.' All points to the importance in former days of the smallest unit of territorial division, the township, organised on account of the special conditions of the county with at least some powers of self-government. Dr Creighton was of opinion that in no part of England did 'the manorial system sit so lightly or work such little change. Traces of primitive institutions and primitive tenures are found in abundance whenever we penetrate beneath the surface.*' He maintained that the 'townships were village communities, each an agrarian unit.'

At the present time there are few if any small freeholders remaining in Northumberland. The land is held in large estates; and the farms are remarkable for their extent. Scattered cottages are rare; the houses needed for the farm-labourers cluster round the farmhouses, generally a row of plain slate-roofed stone cottages with no attempt at ornament, though well-built and comfortable inside. Most of the cottages have been rebuilt and improved within the last fifty years. Some of the older hinds still recall how, at the shiftings from one farm to another in the spring, made common by the custom of annual hiring, they used to take with them, not only their great box-beds and other furniture, but even their window-frames, and trust to fit them somehow into the bare walls of their new abode. The farmhouse itself is generally surrounded by trees, which are allowed to grow thick and close as shelter from the winds. But there is

* See 'The Northumbrian Border: Historical Essays and Reviews' (Longmans), p. 257.

nothing of the comfortable homely look of the south-country farm, with its thatches and tiled roofs; all is grim and businesslike.

Grimmer still is the modern pit-village, the great sign of the changed Northumberland, with its long succession of rows of ugly slate-roofed cottages. These have sprung up chiefly in the southern part of the county, wherever there is a seam of coal to be worked. They generally keep the name of the old township in which they are situated. No art of man, no love for flowers and gardening, has done anything to mitigate their ugliness. The pitman is intelligent, shrewd, and hardworking; he has the characteristics of his race, for the pit-villages are peopled by the descendants of the peasants who flocked to earn higher wages in the coal-mines; but he has no sense of beauty, unless his love for dancing can be reckoned such. He is still famous for his skill in the performance of sword-dances with intricate figures and wonderful steps. What is more important, he is a keen believer in the value of education, and anxious to secure the best for himself and his children.

Coals had long been worked in Northumberland. Henry III, in 1239, granted a charter to dig coal, then and long afterwards known as sea-coal, because it could only be conveyed to London by sea. It was a Northumbrian, and one marked by the best characteristics of his race, George Stephenson, who, by the invention of the locomotive, made possible the great development of the coal trade with all its consequences in the history of industry. Many of the old industries of Northumberland—the lead-mines of Allendale, the leather trade of Hexham, the sword manufactory started by Germans at Shotley Mill, have passed away; but round the mighty Norman keep from which Newcastle took its name, round the home of Benedict Biscop and Bede at Jarrow, have grown up the busy industries of the Tyne; and the black hand of modern industrialism reaches, with its devastating touch, farther and farther up that lovely river valley. No city in England has a more beautiful site than Newcastle; but, in their haste to profit by the new opportunities for growing rich, the people of Newcastle had no time to think of beauty; and in the rapid growth of the city little heed was paid to the advantages of the site,

or to the preservation of the fine old houses which adorned it.

In the early days of Northumbrian greatness, Benedict Biscop tried to foster a love for beautiful things amongst the rude peoples to whom he ministered, by getting skilled glass-makers from Gaul to come and work for him, by bringing vestments, pictures, and images from Rome to adorn his monastery, and by engaging teachers of music for his monks. With Bede in the abbey at Jarrow, literature first flourished in England. But, though the later Northumberland has produced great politicians, from Lord Grey of the Reform Bill to Mr Burt, the miner's representative and friend, great naturalists such as Thomas Selby, and many distinguished antiquaries and men of science, Benedict Biscop and Bede have not had many successors. In Thomas Bewick the Tyne valley can claim at least one great artist, an artist racy of the soil, who lived and worked and died on the Tyne; but it cannot be said that either art or literature has ever flourished in Northumberland. The Northumbrian values things strictly for their utility. The peasants continue to leave their county homes for the more exciting life of Tyneside and the pit-villages; and in most parts of the county, except round Newcastle, the population is steadily declining. During the last few years many of the large farmers have begun to turn their arable land into grass, and to give themselves entirely to stock-raising and feeding, so that fewer and fewer men are needed for the land, and on some of the large farms half the cottages stand empty. There is no fear that any rapid growth of population will destroy the loneliness of the moors and the slopes of the Cheviots. Here, under the wind-swept skies and the clouds whose shadows flit over the wide spaces of the undulating country, the traces of the past can be studied in peace.

The best friends are not those who are the most easily known; and the country which is most loved is not that which shows its charms at first. It is the beauties that we have found out for ourselves, that we have observed and felt as we watched the face of the land and the heavens through the changing seasons, that are the most precious. The charm of Northumberland takes hold of those who feel it until it becomes part of their very nature. It is a

grey land, yet it is full of colour. The great masses of yellow rag-wort rise like a cloud of gold above the soft grey of the bent grass on the Bamborough links against the deep blue of the sea. In the summer, the rich crimson of the *Geraneum sanguineum* gleams amongst the grass on the Embleton sand-hills, which slope upward from a beach yellow with the dust of the shells crumbled by the waves of the North Sea against the basalt rocks. On the Kyoee crags with their fine mountain outline, and the towering summit of Ross Castle above Chillingham, the moor is purple with the bell-heather. Autumn turns the bracken on the moors and links into sheets of tawny gold; and the trees in the river valleys keep their glowing leaves till long into the winter. But more beautiful than even these rich colours are the luminous greys of sea and sky in the clear northern air. The wind is seldom quiet; it sweeps the clouds off the land and piles them in huge masses on the edge of the sea. Birds fill the great solitudes of moor and shore, and break the silence with their cries. It is a land for those who love the sense of space and freedom, who know how to be alone. The luxuriance of the river valleys, the rich profusion of flowers which grow so freely in the sheltered gardens, come as a relief to any possible feeling of bleakness; and in every wide view the eye seeks eagerly the long level of the sea and the beautiful outline of the Cheviots towards the north-west. All will not feel its peculiar charm, but its historical interest and importance are abiding; and it is a cause for deep gratitude that the memorials of its past history should be so carefully garnered for the student as they are in the great county history, which we hope the loving labour of Northumbrian heads and hands will ere long complete.

Art. VI.—MODERN BRITISH ART AND THE NATION.

BETWEEN fifty and sixty years ago John Pye, the engraver of Turner, wrote a book which he called 'The Patronage of British Art.' In this he gave a history of 'the rise and progress of art and artists' up to, and during part of, his own time. The word 'patronage' is now repugnant to the artist, who prefers to take his stand upon the more healthy basis of demand and supply which rules other branches of work. But, if we substitute the word 'demand' for that of 'patronage,' we may perhaps with some advantage follow up this enquiry begun by John Pye, and try to take stock of the progress of art in this country up to the present time. We may also try to forecast its probable future from the signs of to-day—signs which, in some respects, do not look very propitious.

We English are not perhaps what is called an artistic people, but there is a large leaven among us exceedingly susceptible to artistic impressions. It is to these that we must look for the sustaining force of material support and appreciation without which the individual artist, and still more the artistic profession as a whole, cannot continue to exist. The vital question for British art and artists to-day is whether this national body of art-lovers is increasing or decreasing; whether the art of to-day is maintaining its hold upon the people and increasing its constituency, or whether, on the contrary, it is not in danger of becoming only the cult and shibboleth of a few, and those few themselves out of touch with the large body of their fellow-countrymen. Any one who has watched the progress of British art from this point of view must be impressed by the fact that it does not now excite so wide an interest in England as it did some thirty years ago. If it has not lost, it certainly seems to be losing its grasp of the mind and heart of the people. It is of little avail for the newspaper critics to write up this or that technical excellence, and to tell us that salvation can only be won by 'art for art's sake.' Even when we are told that so penetrating an eye as Millais saw that 'much modern work is technically so good that it

requires a very clever fellow to do anything better,' there is still the seed of failure in it if it has no national basis in the love and appreciation of the people. Without this it must still be an exotic, and, like all exotics, will fade away and die as soon as the fostering warmth of its own immediate surroundings happens to fail.

By art which has a national basis we mean something which, to a considerable degree, has been evolved from the instincts, sentiments, and beliefs common to all, and which endeavours to answer some of those unspoken questionings inherent in all imaginative natures. Such art should illustrate life in its fullest sense, and those universal truths which belong to human nature, and are not only beautiful in themselves but are essential to it; which fashion does not change, but which remain the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. If art does not to some extent attempt to do this, it cannot be called national or popular, because it will not appeal widely to human nature; and, if it be not national in this sense, its hours are numbered. A people may live, perhaps a somewhat stunted and incomplete life, without art; but art itself cannot live without the people, nor can it develop into its highest and fullest vitality unless it has succeeded in creating a public which believes in it and supports it because it loves it.

If we consider on what basis popular belief in and love of art have generally rested, the answer may tell us why these are not so strong among us as we should wish them to be at the present day. Whatever the artist and the art-expert may think upon this question, there can be little doubt that this belief in and love of art have never rested entirely, or even chiefly, upon its purely technical qualities. 'What is this about?' 'What does it mean?' 'What idea is it intended to embody?'—such are the questions asked by your Englishman when he looks at a work of art. If the art critic tells him that it is 'an able rendering of certain relations of tones,' or 'an impression of a face in a few masterly touches,' or 'a sonata in brush-work,' he says, 'I have never seen anything in nature like this; and it has not the beauty or elevation of ideas that I crave in a work of art which professes to be something more than the mere record of a natural fact. It is neither nature as I see it, with its

beauty, its subtlety, its exquisiteness of finish, nor does it contain any thought or idea to stir my imagination. Let your experts adore it; I will have none of it.'

It is a trite definition of a picture that it is something between a thing and a thought. The tendency of to-day, fostered by some modern criticism, has been to regard only the thing, and to ignore and disregard the thought. This is the tendency of so-called, but (as we think) falsely so-called, 'realism,' because in no true work of art can the intellectual and the material be separated. The bias of modern criticism towards so-called realism has had the same effect upon pictures as upon some branches of literature, and has resulted in a gradually developed distrust of what is beautiful or imaginative, for fear it should not harmonise with what it is pleased to call the truth. The consequence is that modern art of this type is not even truly realistic, because with all its cleverness—and much of it is wonderfully clever—it is seldom charming, and often ugly.

Now nature is very seldom ugly and nearly always charming. This ugliness is an inevitable result of the abandonment of the ideal, or what we may call the 'end,' and the over-estimation of the 'means' or expression of it. If we were compelled to decide whether, in art, the means or the end had produced the greater effect upon mankind, we should, I think, be obliged to confess that the end has it. But can there ever be a divorce of these two, the end and the means, without irreparable loss to art itself? If it is to be of an enduring kind, must it not invariably be the expression of an idea in the best possible manner? We can, of course, never afford to be indifferent to the means; on the other hand, a great danger to true art lurks in the creed which binds us only to the means. It is natural that the means alone should have a preponderating influence with the painter, since his whole life is absorbed in trying to master technique, and he alone knows its real difficulty; but why should the critic also fall into the same trap and put forward technique of this or that fashion as the single goal of art?

In literature what would be thought of the critic who even hinted at such a principle as this, namely, that a writer who has nothing whatever to say is worthy of admiration if he says it in sonorous words and well-

balanced periods? As Jowett says in his preface to the 'Phædrus,'

'would not a great painter such as Michael Angelo, or a great poet such as Shakespeare, returning to earth, courteously rebuke us? Would he not say that we are putting in the place of Art the preliminaries of Art, confusing Art, the expression of mind and truth, with Art, the composition of colours and forms? Perhaps he might more severely chastise some of us for trying to invent "a new shudder," instead of bringing to the birth living and healthy creations.'

To the expert this kind of achievement may give some pleasure, but this pleasure will be limited to the expert; and, if he be also a true critic, it will only satisfy one side of him.

This principle applies also to what is only the fusion into an artistic and symmetrical whole of any natural object or combination of objects, however able that combination may be. If there be nothing in a work of art beyond this it will only appeal to the expert; yet it seems that towards this end we are driving. Those who know say nothing; and those who do not know are content to believe that art is after all not such an object of interest as they were taught to believe when they were young. Certainly art, as the expression of thoughts and ideas, has not now the hold upon the public which it had thirty or forty years ago. No doubt there are many causes for this. It would take too long to state them all, but some at least of them are not far to seek.

In the first place the artist, however strong his individuality, cannot escape from the influence of his environment. The fashion of his chief contemporaries, however much he may hereafter try to change and remould it by his own originality, will give a certain bent to his own work. The art-student is always singularly impressionable to the particular style and form of art in vogue among his successful seniors. To-day, the great traditions of the past are of little moment to him. He does not often enquire how it came about that his older contemporaries adopted this or that particular style. It is enough for him that the modern masters of technique have adopted it, and that certain writers in the press say that this is the only true and capable

art of the day. He at once decides that he will adopt it too.

Again, in spite of the ridiculous cant preached by some, that an artist should never think about working for a livelihood, the young artist will fear that, if he ignores the art-fashion of his day as set by his successful seniors and the critics, and does only what his own fancy and judgment may prompt him to do, he may not even touch material success. This is a natural thought, of course, a very obvious fallacy, because if the young artist has convictions and is strong enough to persist, he will in the end convert the critic, and become himself a fashion. Such men, however, are few and far between; and many years, which might be beneficially employed in the cause of national art, may be wasted before such a one comes to set the balance right again.

That this struggle between what the artist himself desires to do and what the fashion of the day demands, is one that requires remarkable staying powers on the part of the artist, might be proved by a very simple instance, viz. by the large number of modern subject-painters, who (in some cases, no doubt, unwillingly) have been forced into portrait-painting, and have been obliged practically to abandon that branch of art for which they originally entered the profession. Circumstances have been too strong for them; and it is probable that, if no change in public opinion takes place in the next few years, we may see still larger secessions from that important class of artists which bases its claims to reputation and interest upon the old-world belief that a work of art should express ideas as well as things. This conveys no stricture on the noble art of portraiture, which rests upon such strong foundations that no true lover of art would or could attack it; but it is no treason to confess that, though a fine portrait is to an expert one of the most fascinating achievements of the painter's art, the art which is to capture, hold, and delight people of all classes, and therefore become national, must contain something which a portrait, except in very rare cases, cannot possess. The portrait will interest the few; what is called the subject-picture will interest the many; and a preponderance of this class of art over the former will always mean a larger art constituency and a wider

demand for works of art. When the portrait is entirely in the ascendant, this demand lessens; in the same ratio the art constituency decreases.

A remarkable proof of this rule is afforded by present art conditions compared with those existing in England thirty or forty years ago, when the subject-picture held the lead, and portraiture only a subordinate position. It may also be illustrated by a comparison between our own period and the last half of the eighteenth century, the portraiture of which has recently enjoyed a veritable 'boom,' accompanied by a corresponding fall in the demand for modern works of art.

In the seventies of the last century the eager competition among private collectors of modern pictures exceeded anything known before, and culminated in what is still known at Christie's as the 'golden period.' No doubt many works of a second and third-rate character fetched in that period prices far beyond their merits; and subsequent sales may have brought this fact into somewhat prominent notice, and shaken the faith of that most objectionable of all collectors or dabblers in works of art, the man who buys solely 'for the rise.' But it might be well for those who deride that period and its high prices to turn an equally critical eye upon the picture-market of to-day. It is not difficult to perceive that the present 'boom' of the portraiture of the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries, based no doubt, at first, upon the genuine greatness of much of the art then produced, has degenerated into a condition of things quite as dangerous as anything which existed in the so-called 'golden period.' One of the results of the winter exhibitions at Burlington House has been to open up a new mine of art wealth, both to the seller and the buyer, in the works of Reynolds and Gainsborough and their contemporaries. The fame of the best works of that time has given an artificial notoriety and inflated price to far inferior productions of the same period; and there are those among us who may live to see some of these inferior works fall in value from their thousands to their hundreds and even tens of pounds. The real masterpieces of either period will meanwhile remain equally valuable since, in their way, they are practically priceless.

But, apart from the question of mere pecuniary value,

there are other distinctions which may be drawn between the two periods, in regard, firstly, to the public estimation of and interest in art which they respectively displayed, and secondly, to the class of picture-buyer involved.

We have endeavoured to show that the present is chiefly a portrait period, and have gladly accepted the high place universally claimed for this branch of art; but we have also ventured to point out its limitations as an artistic influence among the people, and the decrease of the art constituency *pari passu* with its growth. It is not too much to say that, except where a portrait, in addition to its own excellence as a picture, happens to portray some well-known character, and thus becomes in a sense historical, it fails to stir the imagination of the uninstructed in art. It is true that it is a representation of a human being, but it brings with it so little of the narrative of human life, its deeds, its passions, and its sorrows, that, outside the mere excellence of its technique, a book of cabinet-photographs will equally satisfy the imagination of the ordinary spectator.

Photography, in its most recent development, is a rival power which must be reckoned with by artists; and the art made fashionable by the modern critic, i.e. portraiture, competes with photography upon its own ground and does not care to accept points by using those gifts of imagination, or of stirring narrative and romance, over which photography has no power whatever. The lay mind has not been slow to realise this, though it may not understand the cause. It finds that modern photography gives such an exact transcript of nature itself, even to its extreme of delicacy and finish, and gives this so easily and so cheaply, that it is satisfied with it. The more so because it finds itself snubbed by the modern art-expert when it looks for something beyond this in art, and asks for some expression of sentiment, story, subject, i.e. the ideal. These, the outsider is told, have properly nothing to do with art. People bow to this because they suppose that the expert ought to know, but they do so with a mental reservation. They say to themselves, 'If sentiment, story, subject, and the ideal have nothing to do with art, then art can have nothing to do with us, and we do not want it.'

This competition with the photograph on its own

ground has led to the weakening or abandonment of many important qualities proper to art. So powerful has been the influence of the photograph that even in colour the extreme modern painter, with the extreme modern critic behind him, who talks of nothing but Whistler—we too take off our hat to Whistler, but only because he represents a remarkable though limited phase of art, not because he represents art itself—has almost abandoned rich and brilliant colour, and tries to harmonise his work as much as possible with the monotone of the photograph, so that neither in subject nor in colour does he follow nature, as the artist sees nature when his eye is still open to healthy impressions.

But there is a still more serious disadvantage under which the modern artist suffers in the eyes of the people whose appreciation should foster a national art; and this is that he has abandoned what used to be called completeness—that is to say, beauty of surface, truth of detail, in fact, finish, that crown of all the best art of the past. He has abandoned this for a rough and powerful method of rapid impressionism, clever to a degree, a most brilliant compromise, but a compromise which really satisfies the expert only, because, on the one hand, it does not bring out the imaginative and romantic quality in art, and, on the other, does not present nature itself as the majority of people see her. The delicacy, completeness, and wealth of detail displayed by nature are, if possible, more impressive to an ordinary eye than the mere aspect or strong impression of a fact—a fact, moreover, which must not be looked into too closely.

But there is still another quality which used to be called the chief aim of art, and which it is now the fashion to ignore—beauty. This is an inevitable result of photographic competition, because, when the ideal is proscribed, the eclectic must go with it; and beauty in art, whether it be evolved from within or without, is based upon eclecticism. The neglect of beauty has even gone so far that, in some cases, modern art prides itself upon its ugliness, and any beauty based upon the great art traditions of the past is scouted as mere conventionalism. It will seldom go out of its way to seek or find this once so highly appreciated quality; and, if it did, some modern critics would begin to talk of want of truth, as if, forsooth,

the beautiful were not as true as the ugly. In this respect both artist and critic might well learn from the inborn craving of the ordinary mind, and enrich the sphere of art by trying to express some at least of the qualities which it craves. Ugliness will never charm unless it does so accidentally by combination with pictorial qualities of a higher order; and, even so, it can never produce the same effect upon the mind as fine painting joined to beauty and charm, or—and we must not wholly ignore the fact—as mere beauty or charm, even without fine painting, produce upon the ordinary man.

Again, because subject, story, or what we may call narrative art, is under a cloud at the present time, the art of design or composition, without which no story can be adequately and impressively told, has lost much of its prestige. The critic ignores it; and the modern artist has almost ceased to value it. When, in reference to modern art, does one ever hear anything said as to the design or want of design shown in any picture which is much talked about? We used to have great designers among us, and no doubt still have artists of high excellence in this noble quality; but it is out of date with the modern expert. In France things are even worse as regards this particular side of pictorial art, in which they used to excel so highly; we wonder what the great French designers would have thought of the diploma and medal which the France of to-day published at the close of its 1900 exhibition.

Design in art seems to exercise an influence over the human soul akin to that of harmony in music. Men who do not know are made to feel; and an impression is produced by the manner in which certain lines or masses or notes are brought together towards a particular purpose or end, which it is difficult to explain, but which cannot be denied. Composition or design possesses this force; and what may be truly called national art will not exist or endure if this quality is wanting. It is not an exotic among us northerners, but is to a great extent inherent; and in this respect it is unlike many of the imported and evanescent qualities, so dear to the modern critic, which have no deep root here, and are foreign to the nature of English art. The accidental and the exotic may have in them a certain evanescent charm; but a universal truth

cast in harmonious form will last for ever. Harmony of design is indeed one of the great qualities of art, which, with others already mentioned, distinguishes it from mere photography or mechanical reproduction of any kind. It is chiefly by the expression of these qualities that the art of a country will gain influence over the hearts and minds of the people; and just in proportion to its strength in this respect will be the strength of its claim to be considered a national art.

Now with all the failings that may be discovered in the art of forty years ago, it certainly made an impression on the national mind, which would seem to show that it responded to something inherent in the national temperament. People flocked to see it; they talked about it; and finally they bought it, having competed for it in a manner which testified to their belief in it. This art had behind it the Preraphaelite movement, which, with all its faults—and from a purely artistic point of view Preraphaelitism contained much that was weak, sometimes even childish—had grasped to the full the salient principle, that art is the expression of ideas. Because these young artists absorbed and believed in this creed, and worked it out in practice, they were accepted at once by thousands who had never been stirred by any art, however able, which expressed only art itself. None of the faults of the school are inseparable from this principle; and there is no reason, except that of the fatal limitations of human gifts, why the best and ablest painter should not also be the greatest artist, i.e. the one who, while he is able to create what is of universal interest to mankind, can also express it in the best possible manner. The Preraphaelite school could not quite attain this, except perhaps in some of the works of its ablest exponent, Millais; but it often touched and tried to express universal truths of vital interest to all men, and, in spite of certain mannerisms and even affectations, expressed them so that all who ran might read. Hence its wide recognition and influence.

The art of dexterous brush-work, which is called 'frank,' the art in which 'tones and values' alone have the mastery, may excite the enthusiasm of a small coterie of painters and their critics, but at best it will only be a sectarian cult or fashion of the day, and will neither last nor spread. The art which is to have a wide influence

should have these qualities indeed, if possible, and should be constantly striving for every new technical excellence that can be acquired by the artist; but it must have far more than these before it will be able to stir the hearts and minds of men. Ideas, too, are necessary; and without these the clever brush-work will fall flat and the nicely-calculated values will prove valueless.

It was because the Preraphaelites adopted this principle that, in spite of their shortcomings and sometimes poor painting, they became a force; and it was by means of this principle that they widened in this country the interest taken in art to an extent which has never been equalled before or since. The influence of art on the national mind culminated when it was most vigorous as a language of ideas. That influence declined directly art *per se* began to take precedence and to limit its aims to the expression of itself and its technical cleverness alone. The final blow was given to it by the exaggerated interest in portraiture to which we have already referred.

Now what is the chief difference between the present day and that so-called 'golden period' of the last generation as regards the hold which art has on the popular mind? In each period British work of the highest class has been 'boomed,' together with works of second and third-rate merit, so that the difference between the two periods does not rest in the fact that inferior art-work has been bought and sold at absurd prices in one period and not in the other. The salient difference is this, that in the earlier period there was a demand for work which appealed to a far wider section of the people than the small body of collectors who principally keep alive the picture-market of to-day.

The bane of each period has been the man who has bought for reasons quite outside those which actuate the genuine art-lover. When prices run so high that a certain notoriety is to be gained by the purchase of some picture which has been much talked of or written about, some buyer, ambitious of mere notoriety, will generally be found. In such a case the desire to buy will be in a ratio to the price put upon the work; and, as regards the work itself, the buyer will, as a rule, care little and know less. It is enough for him that it is for the moment the biggest thing on the fashionable side of the picture-

market, and that no one else has been able to buy it at the price. There are also, of course, some—but few and far between—who, while possessed of ample wealth, have cultivated their taste for painting so assiduously as to care for the technique even more than the ulterior purposes of a picture, and who honestly prefer the fine portrait to any other form of art. Such men are a valuable asset to the country, and have in the past, as we hope they will in the future, done much to preserve our national treasures in this particular branch of art. With these true lovers of art neither the craving for notoriety nor the hope of a rise in prices should their treasures hereafter find their way to Christie's, have any weight.

But outside these two classes is the ordinarily intelligent man, who buys what he loves, and loves that which appeals to him through something beyond those qualities which captivate the millionaire, or those which attract the specially cultivated collector. We have written 'buys,' but should we not more truly say 'bought'? for at the present day this kind of buyer is rarely to be seen; and the weakness and impending extinction of his class is the most alarming sign with regard to the art of the future. The buyer possessed of this characteristic may be almost said to have become extinct as an active supporter of the art of his day. He is one who will not buy what he does not like for its own sake, and cannot honestly follow the critic into his one narrow groove of excellence, which to him may be almost distasteful. In point of fact, this sort of man has practically ceased to buy at all. Yet he was the very backbone of what used to be called the 'patronage' of British art.

It is a question if, without some such customer (let us for once use this honest word of trade), the modern artist can continue for many years longer to maintain his position. There would indeed still be places for the portrait-painter as well as for the illustrator, who is perhaps the most remarkable and brilliant outcome of modern art requirements, though photography is pressing even him hard in many directions. But, without the picture-buyer of the class just mentioned, the subject-painter, and we fear the landscape-painter too, would find it very difficult indeed to live. Bishop Creighton once wrote: 'All art depends mainly upon the existence of a public who will

give orders, a practical detail which is generally forgotten'; and even in the high calling of the artist the simple law of supply and demand will have its way.

Meanwhile what becomes of national art? Is it to be built and nourished on those universal objects of interest common to all cultivated people, by means of which alone it can hope to win the love and appreciation of the many, and thus become national? or is it to be hustled off the public road by those who have learnt to pronounce some shibboleth unknown to the majority of mankind, and rave about qualities which the ordinary sane man does not understand at all, but which others, not wholly ignorant of art, understand only too well. Is our art to be a mere fashion of the moment, the last thing from Paris or Japan promulgated through the nod of the initiated? or is it to found itself upon the universal and the eternal? Behind the former will congregate the few, the 'experts,' the 'knowing ones,' the 'initiated.' The latter alone will convince and satisfy the cravings of the reasonable and normal man, in fact the vast majority of the cultivated classes. There are some who maintain that really good art can only be an object of interest to the few. But is not this because their definition of 'good art' is invariably based upon some peculiar kind of technique, or starts from a point of view which regards only technique? Is it not strange that literature and music, even in their highest forms, can and do appeal to the many, and yet that good art is to be only for the few? If it be true, so much the worse for art, and the less reason for laying down any fixed laws about it.

There is another serious obstacle to the creation and maintenance of national interest in art, one which the experts are themselves constantly increasing. All art which is to be understood and loved by a people must spring naturally and spontaneously from the native soil. Even if, as is necessary to all art, it be built upon and nourished from many sources, and drawn from well-tried traditions of many times and lands, its inherent heart and life must be its own; and even its fashions and manners, i.e. its technique, must in the main be native. Specimens of the work of the great art-nations never look so thoroughly convincing as they do on their own soil and in their own light. Whatever influences come from without must

necessarily be of slow growth; and they must be derived from a kindred stock, or they will never be successfully grafted on the native tree. We can greatly admire the art of our foreign contemporaries, and learn from it too, without imitating it. If, as we are told by some, theirs is better than our own, we cannot make our own better by copying theirs, though, by doing so, we may lose the one or two characteristics in which our own excels.

The art of our brilliant neighbours the French cannot really amalgamate with ours without mutual loss of distinctive qualities, for the respective points of view are essentially different. Du Maurier, himself born a Frenchman, used to insist with animation upon this difference, comparing the charm of a child painted by Millais with the absence of charm in one painted by a Frenchman. Reynolds and Gainsborough, and every other able English artist, see a subject from what we may call the essentially English point of view; and the English artist who tries to adopt the French method, however good it may be, will generally do so at the risk of losing this distinctive quality of the best British art. The same principle applies to the marvellous art of the Japanese. Their art is one of the strange gods that we are now told to worship and imitate; but could there by any possible means be a natural and convincing blend of our northern impulses—noble ones (as we think) on their own lines, with great traditions behind them—and this remarkable sunlit fountain of art which has sprung spontaneously in direct natural growth from its rich eastern source? Those critics who talk of the 'conventions' and 'hide-bound traditions' of our art are surely themselves trying to bind heavy burdens on the English art of the future when they try to force these foreign elements into the art of a country with which they have no affinity. Artists, at least those who think as well as paint, do not make this mistake; and we are glad to see that Mr Clausen, professor of painting at the Royal Academy, said in one of his lectures, after praising the beautiful art of Japan, that 'he did not think it altogether good for our art to come under its influence, and we could not assimilate it.'

But it is only an art appealing to the sense of technique alone that the advanced school of critics will

accept, and the intellectual side of art they will not recognise. Meanwhile they forget that they are preaching this creed among a people not naturally endowed with a subtle sense of the kind so strongly developed in the Japanese and, to a less degree, in the French; while on the other hand the English are naturally gifted with a strong appreciation of the intellectual and imaginative sides of art. The purely technical art of a foreign type they will never, as a nation, absorb. Are they then never to be nourished on the food they really crave and can assimilate? This modern polyglot language of so-called art appeals only to specially trained intelligences, and will never attain a natural growth here or gain a firm hold on the northern mind. Indeed it can never be more than a highly cultivated exotic.

Lord Leighton in one of his addresses said, 'I believe that an art desired by the whole people and fostered by the whole people's desire would reflect some of the best qualities of our race; its love of nature, its imaginative force, its healthfulness, its strong simplicity.' That great imaginative genius and embodiment of shrewd common-sense, Sir Walter Scott, wrote in his diary:—

'All the Fine Arts have it for their highest and more legitimate end and purpose to affect the human passions, or smooth and alleviate for a time the more unquiet feelings of the mind, to excite wonder, or terror, or pleasure, or emotion of some kind or other.' And, after speaking of poetry, he continues: 'In painting it is different; it is all become a mystery, the secret of which is lodged in a few connoisseurs, whose object is not to praise the works of such painters as produce effect on mankind at large, but to class them according to their proficiency in the inferior rules of the art, which, though most necessary to be taught and learned, should yet only be considered as the *gradus ad parnassum*, the steps by which the higher and ultimate object of a great popular effect is to be attained. . . . As I speak to myself, I may say that a painting should, to be excellent, have something to say to the mind of a man like myself, well-educated, and susceptible of those feelings which anything strongly recalling natural emotion is likely to inspire.'

It is, to say the least, a strange coincidence that, while the advanced art-critic has been doing his best to dissociate subject and narrative of any kind from what

he calls art, in music of late years we have witnessed, under the guidance of its advanced school, a phase of something equally revolutionary, though in a directly opposite direction. Since the birth of the Wagnerian school strong efforts have been made to express by music all kinds of ideas, foreign to the sublime impersonality hitherto associated with that art, and to introduce the musical representation of narrative, subject-story, and description, professing to be realistic, which the painter of to-day with his own art, hitherto built mainly on those lines, is now forbidden to attempt.

Though the interests of the artist are involved with much that is written here, this paper is not intended as a direct appeal to him. We have ventured to point out certain principles which we think account in a great degree for the decreasing popularity of art in this country; but the artist will not be much influenced by the advice of any one outside his own special circle. He will go his own way, believing, no doubt rightly, that he will only do with power and charm what he himself honestly feels and believes; but we may be permitted to express regret that his feelings and beliefs should to-day so often wander after strange gods, away from those larger interests which are shared by his fellow-men.

Less still do we hope to influence the modern art-critic who has adopted the 'art for art's sake' creed, though he holds a very feeble position by the side of the artist who fights under the same banner. The artist, at least, knows what he means, and why he means it; and his strenuous pursuit of a most difficult art, where high technical excellence is hardly to be obtained even by the most clever, enables us to understand how easily he may lose his sense of proportion, and place the part before the whole. He has given all he has for this, and may easily forget that a still more excellent thing should be bound up with it; and that, if his efforts are not employed as a means to reach this, much of his labour has been in vain. But where is the apology in the case of the critic who holds this special creed? By what practical work has he attained his right to hold it, or to preach this worship of technicality? And yet some modern critics out-Herod Herod in their purely technical exclusiveness, and brand as Philistines all who disagree with them.

We would rather appeal to a larger and, as we believe, more important tribunal, the educated public, not to the art-faddist. After all, it is to public opinion at its best that the appeal of the artist must be made, both individually and collectively; it is from this alone that he will receive not only the praise and sympathy which will encourage him to go on with his work, but the material help which the public demand for that work can alone supply. But this powerful body, the true foster-mother of the arts, will not respond to the attractions of the hybrid now so largely advertised. The technical canons imported from alien shores do not give either the loveliness of nature as seen by the ordinary observer here, or the charm and dignity of the art which is based upon the well-known and long accepted traditions of the past. The nation will not respond warmly even to qualities of really high technical capacity alone; it will demand more than this to rouse it from its growing indifference. It will demand that high technical skill shall be used as a means to an end, as a language with which to express thoughts and ideas, not as a mere record of facts, however clever and powerful may be their reproduction in form and colour. If modern art is to become in any sense national, or to be anything but a very bad third after literature and music in its influence on humanity, it must rise to heights which will enable it to say, with Macaulay's spirit of literature,

'Mine is the world of thought, the world of dream;
Mine all the past, and all the future mine.'

We may end by saying that this is in no sense a defence of 'academic art,' so called, but the expression of a wish to see the intellectual and emotional sides of art resume the high place which they held during its best periods in the past.

Art. VII.—THE FIRST YEAR OF THE BOER WAR.

1. *The War in South Africa; prepared in the Historical section of the Great General Staff, Berlin.* Authorised translation by Col. W. H. H. Waters, R.A., and Col. H. Du Cane, R.A. Two vols. London: Murray, 1904-6.
2. *The Times History of the War in South Africa.* Edited by L. S. Amery. Vols. I-III. London: Sampson Low, 1900-5.
3. *The Science of War.* By Col. G. F. R. Henderson. Edited by Capt. Neill Malcolm, with a memoir of the author by F.-M. Earl Roberts. London: Longmans, 1905.

THE publication of the third volume of the 'Times History,' and the second volume of the German official account of the war in South Africa, carries us, in the case of the former, down to the occupation of Bloemfontein, and in that of the latter, to the capture of Komati Poort. Each of these books is to some extent the complement of the other, as might be expected from the professions of their authors and from the opportunities and difficulties which the compilation presented to each. When studied together, they offer to any reader possessing some knowledge of military affairs an admirable picture of the first period of the war. The experienced military student will be able to extract from each work its particular virtue, and to discard from each that which is valueless; such discrimination may indeed prove a useful exercise. To the lay reader, however, the matter stands on a different footing. He has no standard by which to gauge the value of conflicting statements or opinions, and of these he will find many; he has no clue to guide his judgment through the complicated reasoning by which the authors endeavour to support their views. Yet without such a standard or such a clue a complete and accurate impression of the events cannot be obtained.

A book which is given to the world as the history of a war should fulfil certain requirements; and it may be useful to state briefly what the main requirements are. Accuracy is expected in the general narrative, and in the detail, so far as detail is essential to the illustration of the narrative, the criticisms, and such principles as may

be deducible from the facts. Criticism is expected; not wanton criticism, but such as is based on sound knowledge and wide experience, intent on seeking truth and rendering justice, and considering seriously the problems that confronted the generals whose decisions are recorded. Finally, there should be that moderation which comes from experience or from profound study of war, so that the sense of proportion may be preserved and due recognition given to the fact that success and failure in war are as a rule relative and not absolute. A work in which these principles are observed takes rank as a valuable document in both a military and an historical sense.

The German book, it may be said at once, approaches very nearly to this standard; and the points in which it falls short are those in which some deficiency might be expected from its origin. Its chief faults are insufficiency and occasional inaccuracy of detail; but, even admitting this defect, the narrative, considering the difficulties which must have been experienced by a foreign staff in collecting and sifting evidence, contains a surprising amount of correct information on matters of fact. Another fault, from an historical point of view, is almost inseparable from an official compilation published for the benefit of the professional soldiers of a particular country, that is, the continual eulogy of authorised German principles for the conduct of war. But it must be remembered that the Great General Staff did not prepare this work solely, or even chiefly, as a contribution to historical literature. It must be judged first as an educational treatise for the use of the German army; and this function it is admirably calculated to fulfil. Not only for the German army, but for soldiers of any nation, the lessons deduced, the principles enunciated, are of great value; and, as a purely military treatise, the book has been eagerly welcomed. In this country, however, the greater interest, as is only natural, inclines to the historical side. Some readers may merely be curious as to the opinion of foreigners on our affairs; but a higher interest is aroused by the knowledge that, in many cases, the looker-on sees most of the game, or at least, from his detached position, is able to judge with more coolness and less prejudice than are those who take part.

In the late war the whole British nation took part;

and, on one side or the other, everybody was a partisan, academic, dialectic, or combatant; a struggle of such grave importance for the nation was bound to exercise a universal influence. But, now that the strain is removed and the excitement subsided, thinking men are becoming ready to reconsider past events historically and impartially; and, to form a right judgment, there can be no better method than the study of the considered opinions of unprejudiced foreigners. 'Unprejudiced' is the important qualification, for the taste of the bitterness caused by prejudiced foreign opinion during the war has not yet left us. In this book prejudice has no place; it is just, even generous, to our soldiers and to our nation; it is equally just to our adversaries. Yet it points out the faults and failings, civil and military, on both sides with a relentless accuracy which is all the more effective because of the absolute detachment of the attitude and the studious moderation of the tone.

The leaders of the opposing forces, to the authors, are but names. They are judged by their deeds, not as romantic heroes or as imbecile amateurs, but as selected officers, invested with authority, each striving according to his lights to gain military advantage. The causes of success or failure are strictly investigated; and the cold reasoning of professional critics will not permit of the sweeping methods, so popular in this country, of ascribing the whole credit of success, or the responsibility of failure, in one case to the general and in another to the troops. The share of each is apportioned with some severity. Evidence is adduced of skill and of errors on the part of the commanders, of heroism and of panic on the part of the men; the authors give the impression of having sought strictly, even narrowly, for the truth, with no ulterior motive save the enlightenment of those for whom they write. Even when the truth has been missed through insufficient information, the reasoning is so cool and moderate that those to whom injustice may have inadvertently been done can hardly resent the error.

The 'Times History' is of a different class. It has already been called the complement of the other, and for this reason, that the English book is remarkable for its success in the very particular in which the German book falls short, i.e. in accuracy of detail. In this it has

achieved an astonishing success; and its authors deserve every credit for the care and labour which must have been required to attain this result. But, for the rest, the inferiority of the English work cannot be questioned. Even its most notable feature, the detail of the narrative, is treated so minutely that the sense of proportion has been lost; the story is swamped in detail. The other conditions which go to the making of a standard history are practically wanting. The fact that separate portions of the book were written by different authors makes it difficult to generalise; but, taken as a whole, it must be said that, in spite of the accuracy of detail, the general narrative does not altogether give a true representation of the events. This is chiefly due to the adjectives; they swarm over the pages, interrupting the train of thought, colouring the story, and qualifying plain facts.

It is not to the fault in style that exception is taken; it is to the overlaying of a false colour on a true narrative. The comments on operations are laborious and academic; but, even when the reasoning is sound, the conclusions are often carried to extremes—a result probably due to a lack of the practical knowledge which serves to modify purely theoretical speculation. The criticisms on individuals are also lacking in moderation; in some cases the appreciation becomes fulsome; in a few the strictures degenerate into something like spite. And, not least, there is a tendency to speculation in alternatives, to the comparison of events which did happen with events that might have happened had other courses been pursued—a system of criticism which is futile under any conditions, but is particularly misleading when applied to the uncertainties of war. It is much to be regretted that the labour which was expended on the foundation of this work should fail of success through a faulty superstructure. It required courage on the part of a band of journalists to attempt the compilation of a book of so technical a nature; and their success would have been welcomed. As it is, the result of their efforts points two morals. One is to be found in the proverb relating to the shoemaker and his last; the other is that possibly the press-censor may be to journalism a friend in disguise, for surely never could a blue pencil have been of more service.

As a proof of the political impartiality of the German authors, three paragraphs from the introductory remarks are worth quoting. They are remarkable as showing the curiously historical note they strike; they might be treating of events a century old. The book opens as follows:—

‘The war in South Africa, which ended in May 1902 with the annihilation of the independence of the Boer Republics, was the termination of the struggle, left undecided in 1881, between Great Britain and the descendants of the original Dutch settlers who had taken possession of the Cape in the year 1652. During the naval wars at the commencement of the nineteenth century England twice seized the Dutch possessions in South Africa; and they were finally ceded to her on the conclusion of peace in 1815. Reasons similar to those which had induced the Boers, as far back as 1835, to migrate northwards, led to the war of 1899. The refusal of the Boer Government to facilitate the acquisition of burghership by the English dwellers in the Transvaal, and alleged disadvantages in political and commercial questions, gave England a pretext for diplomatic negotiations, which she endeavoured to emphasise by strengthening her garrisons in Cape Colony and in Natal.’

After a page of military information about the British forces available for immediate action, another vexed question is presented in a nutshell.

‘The reinforcement of the South African garrison did not have the effect hoped for. On the contrary, it strengthened the spirit of opposition in both the South African Republics. The conviction that the struggle between the Dutch and the English would, sooner or later, have to be fought out, and that the present moment was perhaps not an unfavourable one, was preponderant in the two States, while England’s delay in adopting more serious measures confirmed the Boers in their view.’

The chapter ends as follows:—

‘The Transvaal replied to the mobilisation of the first army corps by an ultimatum addressed to Great Britain. By the 11th of October the latter was to withdraw her troops from the frontiers, and not to land in South Africa those which were then at sea. England could not accept such conditions; war thus became inevitable; and arms alone could decide the issue.’

In this essentially military book there are hardly any other allusions to politics; and few moderate Englishmen will be inclined to quarrel with the outline here quoted. Such may well be the verdict of the future. When party and personal recriminations have died away, and the struggle for South Africa, which continued intermittently throughout the nineteenth century, is considered historically, the truth will become apparent. Some wars are political, some are racial; this war was of the latter type, and as such, sooner or later, inevitable.

The German comments on British military organisation and tactics are short and to the point. It is interesting to note that many of the deficiencies in the training of our men are traced to the difficulty of finding ground on which to exercise troops, and to the infrequency of 'grand manœuvres.' We have heard much of army reform of late; yet the manœuvre vote is that which first suffers when the pressure of economy bears on the army estimates. The late Colonel Henderson, one of the few British soldiers whose talents, without any glamour of battlefield reputation, have forced recognition from the general public, produced an apposite illustration on this point, when, in 'The Science of War' (p. 396), he wrote:—

'According to Mahan the naval victories of England in the Great War were due in great part to the fact that the fleets of France, continually in port, were always at a disadvantage when they met their storm-tried enemies on the high seas. In 1899 the case of the British regimental officer serving at home was somewhat similar to that of the commanders and the crews of Napoleon's battleships. His training, to pursue the analogy, was in still water; his knowledge of navigation and seamanship was often purely hearsay; and he was never permitted to face wind and waves.'

It is an interesting speculation to consider how the efficiency of the navy would be affected if our ships were not allowed to go to sea because of the cost of coal; probably it would be no more ready for war than is the army which is confined to a few acres of government ground for the sake of partridges and pheasants. This lack of practice in manœuvre, and the misconception of certain features of modern warfare engendered by a series of successful campaigns against badly armed and undis-

ciplined adversaries, are noted in the German book as the causes of many of our difficulties in the war; and the authors have, in the course of their narrative, found no scarcity of illustrations to prove their statements.

The events in Natal down to the investment of Ladysmith are dealt with very shortly; and five pages of the eleven devoted to this period are allotted to the fight at Elandslaagte. Yet the narrative and the comments give a clear conception of the events. The concise treatment is, of course, due to the motive of the book. This is an educational work, and there is but little to be learned from the scrambling actions of Talana Hill and Lombard's Kop; while the strategical developments, which have been hotly discussed in this country, present no difficulties to the judgment of the Great General Staff. It has frequently been asserted, and in the 'Times History' it is argued at length in three different parts of the book (each time with a different conclusion), that the alternatives before Sir George White were to hold on to Ladysmith or to retire to the Tugela. The Germans look deeper, and without discussion offer to the general the choice between Ladysmith and Durban, or both. This is a view which will commend itself to those who try to solve the problem without prejudice. Ladysmith could be held for a certain time—that was certain; but there was no certainty, and indeed not much probability, unless the Boers threw away all their chances, that the Natal Field Force could have held any other position except as a besieged army, until its flanks were protected by the sea. The Germans think that the best course would have been to reduce the Ladysmith garrison to a minimum and remove the remainder of the troops, especially the cavalry, to Durban. Of the decision actually made it is briefly said, 'As events turned out, it was decidedly disadvantageous for Sir George White to remain in Ladysmith; but he could not have foreseen this.'

The British leading at the fight at Elandslaagte is favourably commented on in every particular; the completeness of the plan, the excellent combination of the three arms, and the skilful handling of the troops in action, are all noticed with approval. The impartiality of the writers is shown in the description of the last stage of the battle. 'While one portion of the Boers, by

holding up white flags, showed that they wished to surrender, which caused the British to sound the "Cease fire," another Boer detachment of about fifty men made a counter-attack.' It is noteworthy also, as indicating the sense of proportion always carefully preserved by the authors, that the British losses (35 officers and 225 men) are described as trifling. Elandslaagte was indeed in many ways a model battle, comparable only in this war to the action at Driefontein in March 1900; and it is interesting to consider how far the contrast between the complete success achieved in these minor contests and the continual failure in greater battles can be explained by the ability of the commanders to handle the numbers engaged. For the force at Elandslaagte (16 companies, 8 squadrons, 3 batteries) was such as even a British general might have a chance of handling in peace time, whereas in the tactical manœuvring of larger bodies of troops many of the leaders and most of the staff were, through national parsimony, quite inexperienced.

Before leaving this portion of the campaign we may contrast the methods of the two books in their treatment of the subject. The difference in tone may be gathered from the epithets applied to Sir George White. The Germans say 'he was known as an energetic and cautious leader' ('ein tatkräftiger und umsichtiger Führer'); the 'Times' historians say that 'in his younger days he had displayed the same headstrong boldness that distinguished Sir W. P. Symons'—a curiously inappropriate parallel, which they afterwards qualify by accusing Sir George of timidity, and by stating that his conduct 'fluctuated between confidence at times appalling in its rashness, and almost inexplicable hesitation and alarm.' That the authors should think it becoming to sneer at Sir George White's courage, that chivalrous courage whose fine temper has been proved many times, both in the field and in council, shows how taste may become debauched by a diet of adjectives.

As a contrast in matters of military opinion the verdict of the Germans on the soldiers who fought the first battles of the war may be quoted. At Elandslaagte 'the British force, as regards tactics and training, had shown itself quite on a par with its adversary'; and at the battle of Lombard's Kop 'the causes of this failure

are by no means to be found in the way the troops fought, but in omissions and errors of leadership.' The journalists are of a different opinion. They say that the battle of Lombard's Kop 'showed conclusively that in the open field 12,000 British troops were not a match for an equal number of Boers.' This is from vol. ii, p. 255; but in vol. iii (p. 153) it is stated that the Boers had 'nearly 22,000 men concentrated round White's shaken and dispirited force.' This latter statement (adjectives excepted) is correct. As a comparison in style the introduction to the battle of Talana is too tempting to resist. The German account runs thus: On October 20, General Symons' detached force at Dundee was surprised in camp by 4000 men with 6 guns.' The English history is less restrained.

'Day was now breaking—a day typical of the rainy season in Northern Natal. The morning was dull and cheerless. The bevelled crests of broad Impati and gaunt Indumeni were obscured in a grey curtain; and great billows of cloud, like the rollers on Table Mountain which warn mariners in the bay of approaching tempests, curled over their steep edges. On this day they were to be forerunners of a very different tempest—a tempest which, in its ever-increasing din, was destined to drown the very echoes born on the rugged faces of the silent hills—destined to make the names of a peaceful English village and an unknown Kaffir mountain famous in history.'

Each of these lines may be worth its penny, but most editors would consider that rate extravagant. There should be some coherence even in padding; and it is difficult to make sense out of the obscure allusion to Dundee masquerading in the odd guise of a peaceful English village.

The strategical distribution of the British troops in South Africa in December 1899, usually referred to as the break-up of the Army Corps, receives some attention from the German critics. They are inclined to justify Sir Redvers Buller's dispositions; the only alternative suggested, but hardly recommended, is 'to have renounced the relief of Kimberley for the time being, to have left the defence of Cape Colony to the troops already there, and to have concentrated the mass of the Army Corps in Natal for a decisive stroke.' In spite of this suggestion

it appears unmistakably from the comments on the battle of Colenso that the authors are not prepared to say that the forces originally in Natal under General Buller were insufficient. Rather do their criticisms tend to the view that, with better handling, the troops would have speedily forced their way to Ladysmith. Even the gate by Colenso was not impassable; and it is refreshing to observe how the trained military mind reduces to its proper proportions the action of December 15, and refuses to regard as a defeat for the troops a repulse which in this country was magnified into a serious disaster. Disastrous in its effects it certainly was, but in itself not serious; and a clear distinction is drawn between the battle as it really was and the battle as it appeared to, and affected the mind of, the General in command. The strictures on General Buller are severe, yet generous, for they recognise his difficulties. His failure is ascribed to two principal causes—absence of reconnaissance before the battle, chiefly as affecting the importance of Hlangwane Hill; and lack of determination in continuing the action at a time when the one fatal course was to break it off. The authors seem to have come to the conclusion, which appears again and again in the comments on the successive actions of the Natal campaign, that General Buller was looking for certainties, and was so disappointed when he found only probabilities, even when they were promising, that he was unable to take advantage of them. One other comment on the battle of Colenso is noteworthy. The much discussed message sent after the battle by General Buller to the commander in Ladysmith is characteristically explained in four words. The general was 'depressed by his defeat.' With reference to the question of the fighting power of the troops, as compared with the skill of their commander, it is interesting to compare the opinion of our best British military critic. In refuting the statements of a Vienna lecturer, who had sneered at the quality of the British soldier, Colonel Henderson said ('Science of War,' p. 379):—

'Had he known that the troops at Colenso retired by order of the general-in-chief, and retired with the utmost unwillingness . . . had he known that throughout the campaign the great difficulty was not to get the men to advance, but to prevent them advancing prematurely—he would probably

have realised that the failures of an indomitable soldiery were due to mistakes in leading and to the peculiar conditions of modern battle.'

The conclusion is one that might be drawn from almost any of our campaigns, and it is shortly this—that British officers and men in war find it easier to be brave than to be skilful. For bravery is inherent, while skill must be painfully acquired.

Spion Kop has been the subject of more recrimination and more bitter feeling than any other action or series of operations of the war. By many writers, official and unofficial, the whole burden of failure has been laid on one leader or another; on clumsy transport or on faulty reconnaissance; on avoidance of responsibility on this day, or on assumption of responsibility on that day. The reputations of gallant soldiers have been smirched with printer's ink; the records of famous regiments have been sullied by shameful words; and yet, hitherto, no clear exposition of the primary causes of the defeat has been produced. We have it now; and, be it right or wrong, it is welcome, for it lifts the whole discussion from the pit of partisan controversy to the platform of tactical study. Individual mistakes in tactics, in leading, in command, are noted, according to their bearing on the problem. These German critics know that mistakes in war are inevitable; it might be hazarded that they would cheerfully produce a list of mistakes to the score of their fellow-countrymen at Wörth as long as that against the British leaders at Spion Kop.

But it is not to unnecessary delays, or to misdirected attacks, or to errors of judgment in the heat of action that they ascribe the defeat. They put it down to two failings in British leadership, one of which is dependent on the other; and there are few of the generals who took part in the war who are held to be superior to these failings. The first, the cause, is the desire to win victories on the cheap; to defeat the enemy without suffering loss; to gain the reward without making the sacrifice. The second, the corollary, is the repeated failure to attack 'all along the line, to hold the enemy in every section of his position while pushing home at the decisive point.' The disinclination to incur losses by committing troops to the attack of those portions of a position on which

decisive assault was not intended to be delivered is clearly indicated as the real tactical error. Such individual efforts as were made by subordinate commanders in the right direction were summarily checked by superior authority. Thus it came about that every attack was isolated ; that in each case a small portion of the whole available force was thrust on the enemy in hope of snatching a cheap advantage, while the remainder of the troops stood by awaiting their turn. And against each effort, as it was made, the Boers were able to concentrate without interference.

It was not by such methods of attack that decisive success could be achieved. The enemy's strength lay, to a great extent, in his mobility ; and the best way to counteract this was to fix him in his trenches by simultaneous and resolute attacks at every point. General Barton's operations from Chieveley, although neither simultaneous with the attacks of the main force nor very resolute in their execution, certainly held a proportion of Boers in their position at Colenso, and even, according to the 'Times History' (iii, 243), drew reinforcements thither from the upper Tugela. But with the main force there was no real attempt at such policy. The successive attacks were successively repulsed ; the casualties were spread over depressing days instead of being crowded into triumphant minutes ; and failure was attended by sacrifices which might have secured success.

Vaal Krantz, to the Germans, tells the same tale—want of resolution in committing troops to the holding attack, and want of determination in pushing home the main assault. For Sir Redvers Buller's 'pertinacity' in undertaking these operations they have nothing but praise ; it is considered that his 'correct reasoning about the subject must command unqualified approval.' This is with reference to the suggestion put forward by the home Government, and approved by Lord Roberts, that the operations of the Natal army, until the advance of the main force against the Orange Free State had made itself felt, should be confined to a strict defensive behind the Tugela. General Buller, on the other hand, was convinced that it was only by continued offensive tactics on his part that the strategical latitude of the Boers could be limited ; in fact, that unless he kept on attack-

ing, the enemy would contain him with a paltry force, and, while keeping a grip on Ladysmith, would be able to send heavy reinforcements to the Free State. In these views, as has been said, the Great General Staff concur; but for the actual plan and its execution they have no praise. Nor indeed do they find much cause to commend General Buller for his conduct of the subsequent and finally successful operations. Dilatory movements, want of energy, irresolution in action, are severely criticised, while due credit is given to subordinate commanders who showed initiative and determination.

But here again the great fault is emphasised. Speaking of the failure to pursue after the capture of Monte Cristo, the authors say:—

‘But the garnering of the full harvest of success was prevented far less by this mistake, which was moreover such as may easily arise in war time, than by the orders for the attack originally issued by Buller, which could in no way bring about a decisive engagement. If the flank attack was to have an effective result, it should have been delivered on the Boers completely tied down to the defence of their front by the operations of Warren’s Division; it would thus have come on them as a surprise, and they could hardly have got clear of it with such insignificant losses.’

On the heavy but indecisive fighting at Wynne’s Hill and Hart’s Hill there is but little comment; the cold narrative has an incisive voice of its own which renders comment unnecessary. It is not until the development of the plan of attack against Pieter’s Hill is dealt with that an opinion is vouchsafed; and this time it is favourable. ‘While every attack had hitherto been made on a narrow front, unsuitable, as a rule, for the development of sufficient force, the front of the attack on this occasion was at last to furnish ample space for the simultaneous development of all the force employed.’ At last the Natal army was given room to use its strength, and the gallant brigades, which had each in succession tried and failed to do single-handed the work of the whole force, swept on side by side to Ladysmith.

Little reference is made in the German work to the tactical operations undertaken by the forces occupied in the siege and defence of Ladysmith; nor can it be said

that they were of a nature to afford lessons of great value. The meagre account given in this book of the fighting on Jan. 6, 1900, is, however, noteworthy as a specimen of the insufficient and inaccurate information which has already been remarked:—

‘Under cover of darkness the columns advanced noiselessly almost up to the British position, and at break of day threw back in hot haste the weak line holding the southern edge of the Tafelberg. But instead of immediately following up the British, so as to reach with them the northern edge of the Tafelberg (whence they would have commanded the town), the Boers halted and occupied the abandoned position on the southern edge, and thence opened and maintained a fire-action against the British, who had halted in a position on the northern edge in which they soon received considerable reinforcements, particularly in artillery.’

This is not only inadequate but almost entirely erroneous. The ‘weak line’ was the outpost line, and only on the extreme point of Wagon Hill was it ever pushed back to the northern edge of the plateau. The redoubts which lay between the two crests are not mentioned; but they would have had a distinct influence on any ‘pushing-on’ operations. The position on the northern edge was not reinforced by artillery; the reinforcing guns took part in the action from the low ground. It seems probable that the authors have studied this action only from the Boer side; but, if so, it would have been better to confine the narrative to such details as the Boers might presumably know. As it stands, the description is misleading. The only other references to the Ladysmith garrison are those which are necessary to show that Sir George White was always ready to co-operate with the relief force, so far as his means would allow, but that opportunity, even permission, was denied him.

The operations under Lord Methuen in the western part of the theatre of war prior to the battle of Magersfontein were not of a nature to afford valuable illustrations of the science of war. They appeal strongly to the sentiment of the British people on account of the dashing gallantry displayed by the troops. The losses incurred by the small body of Marines at Graspan—44 per cent. in a successful attack—are of historical interest.

But, owing to certain disadvantages under which Lord Methuen's force laboured, it was practically tied to the railway; and manœuvre on a large scale was difficult. The mounted troops were few in number; and information about the enemy was in consequence neither full nor accurate. Transport was deficient, and the free movement of the force was therefore impeded. The country, also, was admirably adapted to the defensive operations of a mobile enemy.

The advance of the British force was, chiefly for these reasons, a succession of attacks, mainly frontal, on prepared positions. That three of these in close succession should have been successful speaks well for the valour of the troops and for the tactical leading of subordinate commanders. In these qualities Lord Methuen doubtless placed high confidence; but a dispassionate examination of the actions leads to the conclusion that the general in command did not, either in his plans or his dispositions, seek to utilise any other method of gaining military advantage. The troops were given an objective and left to themselves. In these three actions there were mishaps and unexpected developments, but in no case were they too great to be dealt with by the troops already committed to the attack. Modder River, however, showed the want of a guiding hand; the plan was vague, and based on incorrect information; and the troops, when checked, lacked the incentive of a recognisable goal. On the left, by the intrepidity of a few officers and men, a minor objective—a possible crossing—was discovered and achieved by the troops, who had for the greater part of the day been enduring heavy fire while groping for the weak spot in the enemy's position. Success won by such methods is not only unlikely to provide any useful lessons, but is, in many cases, misleading. The system of driving straight at your enemy and overcoming him by sheer resolution gives away all the advantages which are to be gained by surprise, stratagem, and skill. Superior numbers, or bravery, or discipline may win battles unaided; but, if trust be placed in these alone, a day of reckoning is bound to come.

In this case the reckoning was paid at Magersfontein. A development arose which was too serious to be dealt with by the troops in action; and failure was at once

accepted as inevitable by the general in command. Our German critics place it in the same category as Colenso—a check which became a repulse because the commander thought it was a repulse. 'The idea that an attack might turn the tide of battle seems to have vanished from the minds of the divisional Staff, although more than half the force had not yet been in action.' And again, 'The reports of the Boers leave no room whatever for doubting that a resolute attack, properly supported from the river, would have succeeded.' Not only was there no thought of attack; for the fighting line there was no support. The Highland Brigade, which had marched soon after midnight, had been surprised in close formation in the darkness, and since dawn had found itself in what the authors call a 'hopeless situation,' received no reinforcement until after 11 A.M., when six companies of the Gordons were sent to its assistance. To the valour of the troops and the devotion of the subordinate leaders the Germans bear ample witness.

'No one can cast a stone at the brave men who, in clumsy formation, were helplessly sacrificed at point-blank range to magazine fire, and were then partly dashed back in disorder. . . . It could only be a question of time as to how long the men would be able to hold their ground. The best troops, if unsupported, must, under such circumstances, and after exertions such as these had undergone, give way. . . . It is in a high degree worthy of recognition that, in the English firing line, attempts were made over and over again to charge the Boer position; but, since there was no sort of unity of leadership, and as no supports were following, it was easy for the Boers to repel these isolated attacks. . . . The gallant brigade clung to its ground just as did our Guards at St Privat; but whereas the latter received powerful support from the rear, Lord Methuen either considered that it was not necessary to reinforce the Highlanders immediately with the whole of his force which was still available, or else that it was impossible to do this.'

With this testimony to the spirit of the Highland Brigade, and with the proof of high courage and discipline already given by the rest of the division, it is evident that it was not the quality of the troops which was defective. The causes of failure must be sought elsewhere. One of them, as placed before us in this

book, is unmistakable: '3000 men, to be supported by 3850 others in reserve, were to carry out the actual attack on the enemy, who was 6000 or perhaps 7000 strong.' When it is considered that the reserve was not used as a support at all, but was diverted to form what the authors aptly name a 'defensive flank,' the lack of success is not astonishing. Another brief statement of the case concludes the comments on the battle, and is also, in some measure, calculated to close controversy.

'Turning now to the Boers, they were quite extraordinarily well fitted for fighting on the defensive; they had had time to strengthen, by means of admirably planned trenches, their position, which was by nature a very strong one; and in addition to all this, the attacker was complaisant enough to run his head against just the very strongest part of that position.'

The operations of General Gatacre on the east and of General French in the centre are only casually referred to by the German historians. This omission is probably due not so much to the lack of tactical interest in these contests as to the want of authentic information on which to base a clear narrative. The 'Times History' contains a chapter on each of these affairs; and in each case the account appears to be accurate so far as the operations of the British are concerned. The description of the Stormberg action, however, is marred by the faults from which few portions of the book are free; the effort to produce a vivid tale has led the authors to use language so lacking in moderation that a suspicion of prejudice is at once aroused in the mind of the reader. Such descriptive touches as 'the general seemed to be deliberately courting a surprise,' and 'Gatacre could hardly believe his eyes,' are not in the historical vein; while the repetition of such phrases as 'more astonishing still,' 'astonishing as it may seem,' 'it is almost inconceivable,' are only excusable on the ground that the authors, although posing as masters, are but novices in the art of war. That grave mistakes were committed at Stormberg is undoubted. The troops were overworked, and, when brought into contact with the enemy, were in no condition to bear the strain of a stiff action. The night march was not well organised; and there was a misunder-

standing between the general and his guides. When the force retired, many officers and men were left behind and captured. These errors may be inexcusable, but they are by no means inconceivable, nor even, considering the hazardous nature of the enterprise, astonishing.

The chapter of the 'Times History' dealing with the Colesberg operations is on a different plane, perhaps because the subject is a pleasanter one to deal with. It is always easier to be appreciative than to be critical; in favourable comment, also, there is not the same temptation to endeavour to make violence of language fill the place of authority derived from reason and experience. In any case, the authors have given us a clear and temperate account of General French's masterly handling of an inferior force in a difficult country. The sound strategical plan, the unceasing reconnaissance, the bold policy of continual attack, enabled his detachment to hold its own from the first with ever-increasing confidence. The intrepid personality of the leader immediately won the trust of his men; success in a few minor encounters led them to trust in themselves; and thus arose a feeling of moral superiority to the enemy which not only inspired the whole force but quickly communicated its influence to the Boers. These operations laid the foundations of Sir John French's reputation among the Boers, on whom the resolution of his tactics and the decisive swiftness of his movements made a deep impression.

Hardly less noteworthy were the efforts of his successor, General Clements. When General French, with the bulk of his cavalry, had been withdrawn from the Colesberg district to take part in Lord Roberts' invasion of the Orange Free State, the new commander succeeded in carrying on the policy of his predecessor, although his force was reduced in numbers and almost denuded of horsemen. When forced in the end to retire, as was inevitable, General Clements succeeded, by determined bluffing, in keeping the enemy's attention fixed on his skeleton force, attracting reinforcements to the enemy from more important points, and effectually blinding the Boers to the menacing concentration of the main British force in the west. We hope that some day the exploits of these commanders may be woven into a continuous narrative as a tactical study. There is no one more

fitted for such a task than the talented soldier who shared in them as chief staff-officer to General French.

On January 10, 1900, Lord Roberts landed in Cape Town. General Buller's troops were just then starting on the enterprise which culminated at Spion Kop; Gatacre was showing an undaunted front near Dordrecht; French was skirmishing actively about Colesberg; and Lord Methuen was still quiescent in his Modder River camp. The forces hitherto available were thus deployed on a somewhat precarious line, but were posted not inconveniently for the development of an offensive campaign with fresh troops. Fresh troops, in the shape of the 6th and 7th Divisions, were at hand; the choice of the direction in which to employ them was the first problem to be solved by the commander-in-chief. There were certain strategical and political advantages in dealing thoroughly with the Free State before invading the Transvaal, which pointed to the selection of Cape Colony as the main route, in preference to Natal. There was hope, also, of the early relief of Ladysmith, as the arrival there of the 5th Division had emboldened General Buller to try his fortune again on the Tugela. The alternative advance from Natal over the Drakensberg into the Free State presented little attraction, chiefly because the railway from Natal stopped short at Harrismith.

Cape Colony having been once selected, the particular line along which the army should advance had to be decided. It is hardly necessary to go into the arguments for and against the routes by Norvals Pont and Orange River Station; they are stated with some fulness in both the German and the 'Times' histories. The rival authors, however, differ as to the reasons which induced Lord Roberts to adopt the western line of advance. In the German book we read, 'In this particular instance the configuration of the country appears to have materially influenced the choice of route'; and no doubt the nature of the country between Norvals Pont and Bloemfontein, admirably adapted for the defensive tactics of the Boers, properly influenced the decision. The 'Times History,' however, favoured with better information, has taken a wider view, and adduces as the chief reasons for

the selection of the western line the considerations that such operations would partake of the nature of a surprise, and that the advance from a flank would cause the automatic withdrawal of the Boer forces from Cape Colony. The political effect of the relief of Kimberley, which could, without difficulty, be achieved without much interruption of the main plan, was also important. Moreover there was the certainty that an advance along the main line would find the whole available force of the Boers concentrated to defend Bloemfontein; while in the case of an advance from the west it was at least probable that some of the commandos in Cape Colony would be too late to take part in the decisive action.

It is probable that these views, much more than any consideration of the nature of the country, influenced Lord Roberts' action; for he was never one to be scared by mere difficulties of ground. Defended kopjes are awkward obstacles to surmount, but so also are Afghan mountains; and Lord Roberts had already proved for himself the truth of the saying that 'difficult ground favours the more skilful general.' But it is noticeable that the authors of the two books, arguing from different premisses, come to the same conclusion. The Germans say 'the grounds for his decision were sound, and the course of the operations showed how correctly he had appraised all the circumstances, and the effect which this advance would exert on the Boers.' The 'Times History,' in passages too many and too long to quote, is equally emphatic in praise of the general plan.

On the execution of the plan the German comments are not invariably favourable. They have no strictures to make on the action of the commander-in-chief or of his staff; the mishaps and misadventures which occurred, and the manner in which they were met, are in most instances used as proofs of the steadfastness of the leader and the ability of his assistants. It is rather the subordinate leaders who are criticised. Faulty reconnaissance by the cavalry division is alleged; how far this could be explained by the desire to preserve secrecy there are at present no means of knowing. The avoidance of proper responsibility on the part of the officer commanding the 9th Division in the matter of detailing an escort to the convoy which became the first of De Wet's many

great prizes, is noted with disapproval. Other faults are observed in the later stages of the operations.

The most notable feature of the relief of Kimberley was, no doubt, the charge of the cavalry division at Klip Drift. It is striking, not only as a daring and original manœuvre, but also as an example of remarkable intuition on the part of the cavalry commander. The conception and the method of execution were alike due to General French; the officers and men of the brigades had nothing to do save to ride straight and trust in their leader. The loss on both sides was trifling, but the moral effect was great. The German authors term it a 'staggering success,' and state that 'The main body of the Boers, leaving fifteen killed and wounded, fled towards Magersfontein; and their terror was such that, by their exaggerated accounts, they communicated their dejected spirits to the other burghers in laager.' It is not unreasonable to suppose that General French's success, two days later, in holding up Cronje's whole force with something like a thousand mounted men, was due to the feeling of moral inferiority impressed on the Boers by this charge.

The siege of Kimberley is contemptuously dismissed by the Great General Staff as 'rather a pretence than a serious military enterprise.' Elsewhere in the book, however, the political importance of its defence and relief is recognised. But that the cavalry division should have been sent actually into Kimberley is regarded as a mistake. Its proper business was the reconnaissance and perhaps the envelopment of the Boer force at Magersfontein. It is pointed out that Cronje's final failure was due largely to his own errors; the other factor was 'the indefatigable General French, who, by his own energy, had accomplished the seemingly impossible.'

On the much debated question of Lord Kitchener's decision to attack at once, when it was found that Cronje had been intercepted at Paardeberg, the two books are in agreement. The German book states the case concisely.

'It was known that numerous and strong bodies of the enemy were hastening from Bloemfontein and the Orange River to reinforce Cronje; and, as their arrival might, under certain circumstances, destroy all the advantages hitherto gained, prompt action seemed to be desirable. Bitter experience had likewise shown that the difficulties of the attack would be

multiplied if time were given to the Boers, who were so skilful in rapidly strengthening a position. But, as they had as yet thrown up only weak entrenchments, it still seemed possible to overcome their resistance easily and without too great loss, especially as all the information concerning the enemy was to the effect that he was very much dispirited, and that the ceaseless pursuit of the preceding days had greatly weakened his power of resistance. There was also another consideration. The great scarcity of means of transport and the threatened commissariat difficulties rendered the early capture of the numerous carts and supplies, which the Boers were known to possess, of enhanced importance for the rapid success of the move on Bloemfontein.'

The 'Times History' supports similar views with a flood of highly-coloured language which leaves the reader in much the same condition as were, according to this work, the British at Spion Kop—a state of 'paralytic stupor.' However, the conclusion is correct, and equally so the opinion expressed in both books that the attack should have been renewed on the morrow. And in both books it is recognised—after the event, be it said—that the effect of the British losses at Paardeberg, although in no way abnormal, was apparent throughout the war in the disinclination of the British generals to bring their enemy to close action, and in the acceptance of indecisive results, if only they were gained without serious loss.

The errors in the tactical handling of the troops at Paardeberg do not, of course, escape notice. The German critics give us a careful plan of attack, based on German methods, as a guide, and condense the errors of the British commander into a sentence. 'Several isolated attacks were made without sufficient artillery support.' Further, they hazard a guess as to the cause of the errors, and come to the conclusion that Lord Kitchener underrated the moral strength of the Boers, and was convinced that a resolute attack would cause a speedy surrender. The attack of the Prussian Guards at St Privat and the premature advance of a cavalry division at Gravelotte are adduced as instances of similar 'illusions.' It is also noted that Lord Kitchener had had no practice in handling large bodies of troops. The authors' ignorance of British political conditions is apparent in the naïve statement that 'the manœuvres on a large scale which now take

place in England are chiefly due to the sanguinary teachings of South Africa.' The fact that British Governments hold blood cheaper than money was inconceivable to the authors, who, writing in 1904, would naturally imagine that the manœuvres of 1903 would be repeated.

Whether the successful issue of the operations was due to Lord Kitchener's energetic measures, or was achieved in spite of his tactical failure, is a puzzle, the key to which lies in the memory of one man, General Piet Cronje. He may have been held to his position by the fighting on Feb. 17, or he may have intended to hold his ground in any event. But it may be taken as a general rule that, when operations are successful in spite of tactical misadventures, there is not much the matter with the scheme. It very rarely occurs in war that successful operations can be described as too costly. A commander must be prepared to accept losses; and nothing is more difficult to assess than the price which must be paid for victory. Tactical mistakes are always made. Some successful generals are better than others; but the very greatest most readily admit their errors. The value of any operation of war can be judged practically only in one way, by its effect on the enemy. In a tactical sense Lord Kitchener's attack was a failure; it did not produce such immediate effect as to secure a tactical victory. But his policy in attacking is a different matter.

It may be that the mere fighting, apart from any question of its success or failure, fixed the enemy at Paardeberg, and therefore made the final success possible. If this were so—we may guess it, but do not know—if the mere joining of battle were a means of securing a strategical advantage, then Lord Kitchener was doubly justified in his attack, for he had two favourable possibilities to grasp, one tactical, and, if that failed, another of strategical value. Stonewall Jackson's attack at Kernstown in 1862 was not very well conducted, and resulted in tactical failure; but the very fact of the attack being made had far-reaching strategical effects. The same may be said of Mars-la-Tour (1870). In these cases there was the same double possibility. Immediate tactical success was hoped for, but was not essential. Resolute fighting was essential; and, whether the battle were lost or won, so long as it was fought, the strategical advantage was

secured. It was thus also at Paardeberg; and the losses incurred there were the price, not of the loss of a battle, but of the capture of the enemy's force.

The Boers who had gathered for the defence of the capital of the Free State attempted on two occasions to bar the advance of Lord Roberts' victorious troops. Of the first of these minor actions—Poplar Grove—there is little to be said. Some misunderstandings among the British leaders, and an unusual nervousness on the part of the Boers prevented the attainment of any decisive result, while the exhausted condition of the cavalry horses rendered pursuit hopeless. The other combat, however, at Driefontein is full of interest. Owing to the fact that a tenacious resistance by the Boers at this period was not expected by the British leaders, the 6th Division was left unsupported to fight its own battle; and the numbers in action on each side were, for this reason, not very unequal. The British, attacking, lost 17 officers and 404 men; the Boer losses, according to the German account, were somewhere between 300 and 450. 'Driefontein,' say the German authors, 'will always remain a glorious day for the 6th Division and its general.' And they give reasons. The Boers were entrenched in a strong position, and fought courageously. Yet such was the skill of General Kelly-Kenny and such the determination of his men that, after a stiff fight, during which the last reserves on both sides were thrown into the battle, the Boers were driven from their trenches in disorder. To the tactics employed by the general, the German critics give the highest praise in their power; 'they were based substantially on the same principles which the German regulations . . . have laid down for the attack for a long time past.' They assert that

'the victory of Driefontein was due chiefly to the correct use of deep formations, and to the unity of command which characterised the proceedings throughout. . . . Except Elands-laagte, Driefontein was indeed really the first action of the campaign in which the British, appreciating correctly the importance of fire as the one decisive factor in the modern battle, fought with a definite plan, and with a determination to acquire the superiority in fire.'

The operations between March 13, on which date Lord

Roberts entered Bloemfontein, and the end of September, when the first phase of the war came to a close, are condensed by the German authors into some thirty pages of their history. There is therefore very small space for criticism or comment, and even the narrative, although clear, is hardly complete. The last chapter however, which is headed 'Tactical Retrospect,' is very valuable. In it the faults and failings of both sides are analysed and criticised with merciless accuracy. Of those scored against the British leaders, some are tactical, as the desire to get to close quarters with the enemy without first gaining superiority of fire; the supposition that the artillery bombardment and the infantry attack should form two separate phases of an action; the unwillingness to throw in all available troops in the endeavour to gain a decisive success. One fault is national—the fear of incurring loss—which led to irresolute operations, to the prolongation of the war, and, in the end, to losses far greater than would have been necessary for the crushing of the enemy in decisive action.

'Furthermore, a reluctance to incur losses often leads to a small portion only of the force being employed in attack, while the remainder are either kept in reserve or so timidly handled as to lend no assistance whatever to the assaulting troops. Such half-hearted tactics bring with them their own punishment.' ('Science of War,' p. 83.)

Thus wrote Colonel Henderson, who, had he lived, would have been our own historian of the war. It is indeed the great lesson of the struggle, for soldier and civilian alike, that decisive success cannot be won without paying the price, but yet that defeat, or even failure to win, is more costly than victory.

Such a book as this German official account is of great value, perhaps of more value to this nation than to that for which its teaching is intended. An effort has here been made to present briefly the point of view from which the professional soldiers of a military nation regard a contest which to us was a great war; but it is impossible within the limits of a few pages to do anything like justice to a work of such importance and authority. It is not in the clear and concise narrative, welcome as it is, that its chief value lies. It is a critical essay on modern

war, and as such cannot fail to make a profound impression on the minds of those who study its pages with a real desire for enlightenment.

If there be some who, while appreciating, are not yet completely enlightened, they will find the key to many problems in the final essay on 'The Science of War.' It is the last message of the author to his countrymen, and it deals with the subject which was always nearest his heart—the British Army. The causes of its success or failure in the past or in the present are there sought for and set forth by a devoted and single-minded soldier. To the evil influences which he had combated throughout his life—the lazy conservatism which discouraged study and stifled initiative, the glorification of routine, the optimism which refused to appreciate the lessons of modern wars—he attributes much of the failure; to the devotion, patriotism, and discipline of officers and men he ascribes much of the success. These are the faults and virtues of the soldiers themselves, for which they alone are responsible. To the nation, for the share it has taken in forming and maintaining an efficient army, the author gives but little praise. The public has been apathetic; successive governments have been indifferent; organisation, which, be it noted, is a duty which the State has never delegated to the soldier, has been neglected; the problem even of our military requirements has only lately been seriously considered. If military requirements are not correctly appreciated, then armies are sacrificed, as was the British force at New Orleans; if organisation is faulty, then the death-roll is multiplied, as in the Crimea; if opportunities for the practice of manœuvres are denied to the troops, they must acquire skill by 'sanguinary teaching,' as in South Africa. These are examples from the past; and, unless the people awake to a sense of their negligence, they will be repeated in the future. The responsibility is not to be evaded.

'The army of Great Britain is practically commanded by the nation, through its parliamentary representatives. Is it not the business of the nation to see that these representatives have some knowledge of the work with which they are entrusted?'

Art. VIII.—JOHN KNOX AND THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

1. *The Works of John Knox*. Collected and edited by David Laing. Six vols. Edinburgh, 1846-1864.
 2. *John Knox: a Biography*. By P. Hume Brown. Two vols. Edinburgh: Black, 1895.
 3. *John Knox*. By Florence A. MacCunn. London: Methuen, 1895.
 4. *Politics and Religion: a Study in Scottish History from the Reformation to the Revolution*. By W. Lee Mathieson. Two vols. Glasgow: MacLehose, 1902.
 5. *John Knox and the Reformation*. By Andrew Lang. London: Longmans, 1905.
 6. *John Knox: the Hero of the Scottish Reformation*. By Henry Cowan. London: Putnam, 1905.
 7. *Mary Stuart*. By Florence A. MacCunn. London: Methuen, 1905.
- And other works.

FOR readers of Scottish history last year possessed a double significance. In August 1305 William Wallace perished nobly at London in Scotland's darkest hour. Somewhere in the course of the year 1505, according to tradition, John Knox was born near Haddington. Of these two centenaries Scotland chose to celebrate the latter and to ignore the former, although, before the opening of the year 1905, it had been shown that the actual quatercentenary of the birth of Knox will probably not occur until the year 1913-14. The choice appears arbitrary, but it need not be regarded as a proof that the memories of the War of Independence have lost their hold upon the imagination of Scotsmen.

The neglect of the Wallace anniversary is due partly to ignorance of the personality of the man, and partly to the absence of any organisation within whose sphere of interest such a celebration might come. If Wallace has left his name, 'Like a wild flower, All over his dear country,' it is the name alone which has survived. The blind minstrel who, nearly two centuries after Stirling Bridge, attempted to revive the traditions of the hero by expanding the scanty record of his deeds, has left us just the kind of picture of a warrior which we should

expect from a wandering minstrel telling his story to the subjects of James III. Our more critical age refuses to find in Blind Harry's verse the true portraiture of William Wallace any more than in the wild invective of the English author of the '*Flores Historiarum*,' who described him as 'a renegade from religion, a sacrilegious man, an incendiary, and a homicide, a man more cruel than the cruelty of Herod, and more insane than the fury of Nero.' The truth may lie between the two; but, whatever it may be, it is now past finding out. If the name of William Wallace were excised from Scottish history, the narrative of the resistance to Edward I would become unintelligible; yet of the man we know only what we can infer from his noble passages across the stage of history.

With Knox it is far otherwise. Every Scotsman feels that, if he were to enter his country's Valhalla, there are three shades of the mighty dead whom he would recognise and know as if he had lived with them in the days of their flesh—as if he had listened with awe and reverence, or in terror and hatred, to the voice which in one hour put more life into the enemies of Rome 'than fyve hundredth trumpettes continually blustering'; as if he had heard Robert Burns talking in Ayrshire cottages or in Edinburgh drawing-rooms; or as if he had rambled with Sir Walter by Gala and Tweed. Each of us has his own Wallace and Bruce, his own Mary Stuart (though, to be sure, for most of us she is not very different from the Mary of the 'Abbot'), his own Montrose and Dundee and Prince Charlie. But John Knox, Robert Burns, and Walter Scott remain superior to all the changes and chances of the life of the immortals. There is a kind of common consciousness by which and in which they live; about the main lines of their portraits, and even about most of the details, there is, rightly or wrongly, an almost unanimous agreement. It required, therefore, no great effort on the part of the Church of Scotland and its sister Presbyterian churches to obtain for the quatercentenary of Knox a recognition both general and enthusiastic.

The occasion has been marked by the production of a number of books, large and small, few of which, with one considerable exception, add anything to the knowledge of those acquainted with David Laing's edition of Knox's works, prepared for the Wodrow Society between 1846

and 1864, and Prof. Hume Brown's biography, published in 1895, which remains the standard 'Life' of the Reformer. Laing's labour of love, for which he received no pecuniary recompense whatever, contains not only Knox's 'History of the Reformation in Scotland' and his theological writings, but most of his known letters. It is not, like Dr McCrie's biography (originally published in 1812), a piece of special pleading, but it represents the orthodox tradition of Knox's character and work. 'I do not profess any blind admiration,' he wrote; but his admissions are frequently guarded by an ingenuous denial of their importance. 'There is no occasion to deny,' he says, 'that Knox regarded the slaughter of that villain Davie [Rizzio], an abuser of the commonwealth,' to be 'a just act, and worthy of all praise.' He also openly maintained that it was 'the duty of the Christian magistrate to put to death all incorrigible idolaters, professed infidels, and enemies of the truth.' Yet, merely on the ground that, in spite of Knox's great influence, the Government never executed any Papist, Laing felt himself free to say in the same paragraph: 'This freedom from a persecuting spirit is one of the noblest features in Knox's character.' Similarly, while he admitted that 'there are passages in his works which I could wish he had not written,' he found nothing in the Reformer's conversations with his sovereign which he could have wished unsaid. 'However plain-spoken Knox might be in their conferences, there never was any of that rude insolence on his part which it is so customary to allege.' Yet in his first interview with the young Queen, Knox told Mary that he would be 'as well content to live under your Grace as Paul under Nero.'

We have no desire to disparage David Laing's great work, to which every student of the Reformation must for ever be under obligation. We have quoted these passages because they illustrate the great difficulty of approaching this subject. Laing was a learned student and a candid and fair-minded historian. In treating of any other personage he could hardly have failed to discover a 'persecuting spirit' in constant reiterations that the idolater (by which, of course, was meant the Roman Catholic) should die the death, or 'rude insolence' in a comparison between the Queen of Scots and Nero. The belief in the Knox of tradition was too strong for even

a man
of
contra-
actions

a
persecutor

an elementary perception of the true perspective. A canonisation, none the less powerful in its effects because it was conferred by popular consent alone, had placed the virtues of John Knox beyond the reach of the 'Advocatus Diaboli.' The impress left by the great man upon his contemporaries became a potent and effective tradition under Andrew Melville; and this tradition exercised no small influence in the seventeenth century. As time went on, and as the appeal to the sword passed into the region of history, a large proportion of Knox's followers came to adopt the doctrine of toleration, though a faithful remnant continued to raise its voice in helpless protest against the evil Act which permitted 'Anabaptists, Erastians, Socinians, Arminians, Quakers, Theists, Atheists, and Libertines of all kinds,' to vent 'their damnable and hellish tenets and errors' without check or control. This minority dwindled; and the tradition on which the majority continued to live became softened and mellowed. Each of the last four generations has tended to ascribe to Knox ideals of its own day, and to attribute to him all the doctrines and customs received from its own immediate predecessors. But these were never more than modifications. The background of the picture varied; its tints were toned down; but, through it all, the portrait remained the same. It was the same Knox that men loved or hated in the days of King Charles, or of King George, or of Queen Victoria.

For, of course, there were always haters as well as lovers, although the faithful were ever in a majority. Not only did the Roman Catholic retain his own opinion of the great enemy of his Church (modified only as gross and ridiculous scandals passed into oblivion), but the enemies of Andrew Melville and of the Covenanters accepted the current identification of Knox with everything that they most disliked; and, even within the re-established Church of Scotland, there grew up in the eighteenth century a school which drew but little inspiration from the spirit of Knox. The greatest of the Moderates, Principal Robertson, was little likely to take an extreme view in opposition to the received tradition of his Church. His estimate of Knox is not marked by any prejudice against the Reformer; but, while he accepted, without much enthusiasm, the orthodox verdict,

he pointed out the defects which David Laing afterwards endeavoured so strongly to conceal.

'His maxims' (he says) 'were often too severe, and the impetuosity of his temper excessive. Rigid and uncomplying himself, he showed no indulgence to the infirmities of others. Regardless of the distinctions of rank and character, he uttered his admonitions with an acrimony and vehemence more apt to irritate than to reclaim. This often betrayed him into indecent and undutiful expressions with respect to the Queen's person and conduct.'

Lord Hailes, who, in spite of an Eton education and many English friendships, remained as good a Presbyterian as Robertson himself, went further, and attacked the trustworthiness of Knox's 'History,' which is also his autobiography, and on which we depend for our best knowledge of the man. Neither in the 'History of Scotland' nor in 'Tales of a Grandfather' does Scott speak enthusiastically of Knox, although he accuses him only of 'indecent violence' unfitting the pulpit.

The spirit of the nineteenth century was so antipathetic to that of the eighteenth that a reaction against this rather colourless verdict was sure to affect later writers on the Scottish Reformation; it can scarcely be said to have affected the popular impression, because there is no evidence that this was ever influenced by Robertson or by Hailes. It so happened that the reaction followed the lines of the evangelical revival of the early years of last century; the question immediately passed beyond the region of historical discussion; and the merits or defects of Knox became the watchwords of opposing ecclesiastical politicians. Mr Andrew Lang ascribes to Thomas Carlyle the introduction of 'a style of thinking about Knox which may be called platonically Puritan.' We should prefer to lay the responsibility upon the shoulders of Dr McCrie. The significance of Dr McCrie's book appears to us to be that he restated the case with great learning, but with the firm determination to ignore all that had been gained by the detached treatment of the subject current at the end of the eighteenth century. It was not only that neither Robertson nor Hailes had said the last word on John Knox; McCrie declined to admit that they had said anything at all. A not unfriendly protest in the

'Edinburgh Review' of September 1816 pointed out the fallacies of McCrie's argument on the very point on which David Laing was, fifty years later, to take the same sophistical view. The reviewer rightly repudiated the plea (which reappeared in numberless places last year) that Knox was not intolerant because no one was put to death in his lifetime.

'It is a topic of reproach' (he wrote), 'and not of praise, that aversion to blood has prevented a magistrate from executing justice on a murderer, or a general from saving his country by cutting off an invading army; and to a person who believed what Knox believed, it must have appeared incomparably worse to spare the Papists, who were the murderers of souls, and whose idolatry was bringing down the wrath of heaven on the land.'

The protest fell upon deaf ears. The Non-intrusion party in the Establishment constituted themselves the special guardians of Knox's reputation; and, after the Disruption, a belief in Knox's infallibility became almost an article of faith in the Free Church. The Established Church could not decline such a challenge; and all sense of historical perspective was lost in the effort to prove that each party represented the true traditions of Knox. Outside the arena of the ecclesiastical conflict a similar effect was produced by the eloquence of Thomas Carlyle, although Carlyle was too good an historian to deny that Knox was both narrow and intolerant. Thus it has come about that, in some important details, the character of Knox has, in the nineteenth century, been generally misinterpreted. The nature of his work has been similarly misunderstood, both in Scotland and elsewhere; and these misapprehensions, many of which ought not to have survived Laing's work, remain to this day. One book, published last year, spoke of him as the founder of the Presbyterian system of church government; another attributed to him a purely commemorative doctrine of the Eucharist; several referred to him as an uncompromising opponent of priestly power or authority in any shape or form. These elementary blunders are coming, in these days, to form an integral part of the popular conception of Knox. How far is recent literature upon the subject likely to correct these and similar errors?

For Prof. Hume Brown's book we have a profound admiration. It is the fruit of much patient labour; and its learning is only equalled by its modesty. It is he who has definitely settled the long dispute about the true portraiture of Knox, disposing, in a single paragraph, of Carlyle's rhetorical plea for what is known as the Somerville portrait; and it is to his research that we owe the correction in the year of Knox's birth, although he did not in 1895 definitely reject the traditional date. The fact that he modestly relegated to an appendix the letter of Peter Young to Beza, which is the best authority on these points, and which Dr Hume Brown himself introduced to English readers, has tended to deprive him of a credit which is justly his. Above all, it was he who first attempted the task of writing a biography of Knox in the light, not only of Laing's edition of the Works, but of all the volumes of state papers, etc., which have been rendered available in the last thirty years. It fell to him to sift the material and to get rid of a mass of unauthenticated gossip which obscured the real issues. He brought to bear upon the question, not only an enlightened mind, but a sound judgment; and, if his attitude is conservative, it is not because he has been guided by prejudice and prepossession. At the same time he occasionally evinces an unwillingness to express an opinion where the reader feels certain that, if it were expressed, it would not be favourable to Knox; and portions of his narrative, as it seems to us, are marred by too implicit a confidence in the accuracy of Knox's own statements, which, when Dr Hume Brown wrote, had scarcely been impugned.

Again, the Reformer's asperities are almost unconsciously toned down—as, for instance, in the description of Knox's interviews with Mary. The biographer is doubtless right in selecting a special topic from the record of the first of these interviews. 'The most memorable part of his discourse is that where he denies the right of the prince to impose his religion on the people.' But an account of the conversation which omits Knox's comparison of the Queen to Nero, and his description of her Church as that 'Roman harlot,' obscures facts which ought to be known to the reader who is called upon to judge between the prophet and the sovereign. Nor has Dr Hume Brown any stronger word than 'unflinching' for

Knox's insolent reply when the Queen, having asked him about a sermon which he had preached against her, went on to invite him in future to come and tell her if anything in her conduct displeased him.

'I am not appointed to come to everie man in particular to schaw him his offense; for that laubour war infinite. Yf your Grace please to frequent the publict sermonis, then doubt I nott but that ye shall fullie understand boyth what I like and myslike, als weall in your Majestie as in all otheris.'

It may have been in these words that Andrew Melville found the inspiration for his answer, addressed, with almost equal insolence, but with the excuse of greater exasperation, to Mary's son, when he called him 'God's sillie vassall.' The claim was the same in both cases; to the preacher, endowed with a message from on high, the sovereign was no more than 'everie man in particular.' It is possible to defend this attitude in such an instance as Nathan's rebuke to David, although Nathan behaved with a courtesy unknown to Knox and Melville. But the difference lies in the fact that the messages which the Scottish prophets had to deliver were connected with the politics of the day, and that they themselves were the leaders of a great political party.

On the great questions at issue, our own sympathy, like that of Dr Hume Brown, is with Knox and not with Mary; but we are unable to accept his view of the relations between the two.

'The truth is' (he says) 'that if there was any attempt at browbeating, it was on Mary's part, and not on that of Knox. When she summoned him to her presence, it was with the express purpose of imposing silence on him by force of her own will and the opinion of the Court. As she arranged their interviews, Knox had nothing to fall back upon but his native force of character and the intensity of his conviction.'

This seems to us to be a misreading of the facts. Knox knew that he could in the last resort rely upon most of Mary's Council and Court, and that he could at all times depend upon the support of popular opinion. Nothing is more remarkable than this unvarying confidence in himself as master of the situation. 'Why should the fair face of a gentlewoman effray me?' he asked, summing

up the forces against him after one of these interviews. Over and over again he expresses his sense of power. When Mary came to Scotland and ventured to attend the services of her own religion, Knox,

'inveighing against idolatrie, schewt what terrible plagues God had tacken upoun Realmes and Nationis for the same'; and added, 'that one Messe (thair war no mo suffered at the first) was more fearful to him than gif ten thousand armed enemyes war landed in any pairte of the Realme, of purpose to suppress the hoill religioun.'

The language seems strong enough to us, and its vehemence was remarked by Elizabeth's agent, Randolph; but, four years later, Knox lamented its weakness.

'Albeit that I spack that which offended some, yit did I not which I myght have done; for God had not onlie gevin unto me knowledge, and tounge to maik the impietie of that idoll knowin unto this Realme, but he had gevin unto me credyte with many, who wold have put in executioun Goddis judgementis, yf I wold onlie have consented thairto. But so cairfull was I of that commoun tranquillitie, and so loth was I to have offended those of whom I had conceaved a good opinioun, that in secreat conference with earnest and zealous men, I travaled rather to mitigat, yea, to slokin, that fervencye that God had kyndled in otheris, than to animat or encorage thame to put their handis to the Lordis work. Whairintill I unfeanedlie acknowledge myselff to have done most wickedlie; and from the bottom of my heart, askis of my God grace and pardon, for that I did not what in me lay to have suppressed that idoll in the beginning.'

The repentance would seem to have been as effectual as it was unnecessary; but the interest of the passage for us lies in Knox's confidence in his power to have put in execution God's judgments when Mary reached Scotland. The Queen was an obstinate 'idolater'; and no one who has read Knox's dispute with Lethington on the deposition of idolatrous princes, or his appeal for a Phineas or a Jehu to remove Mary Tudor (before the fires of Smithfield were actually kindled), can hesitate as to what 'God's judgments' meant. The people, 'yea or ane pairt of the peopill,' might, he held, execute that judgment against an idolatrous king; and that judgment was, 'The idolater shall die the death.' It was not easy for Mary to browbeat a man with this faith and this knowledge in him.

The relative position of Knox and Mary is well illustrated by the story of Knox's trial on a charge of treason. Mary had, as we have just seen, obtained, with difficulty, permission for the celebration of mass in her own presence. In 1563, while she was on a progress, some of her household had a celebration of mass within the precincts of the palace of Holyrood. This proceeding roused great indignation in Edinburgh; and two of Knox's followers were guilty of disturbing the service by a brawl. For this offence they were, very properly, charged with a violent invasion of the palace. Their excuse was that certain Acts of Parliament (never ratified by the Queen) had made the celebration of mass punishable with death, and that the priests of the royal household had broken the law; but the defence may not have seemed to Knox legally adequate, and he resorted to other means to secure their acquittal. There was a bad old Scots custom by which an accused person brought with him a crowd of retainers to overawe the Court. Knox determined to adapt this device to the new circumstances, and he addressed a circular letter to the faithful, explaining the circumstances, defending the criminals, and concluding with this appeal:—

'I can not but of conscience crave of you, my Brethren, of all estaitis, that have professed the treuth, your presence, comfort, and assistance, at the said day, in the Toun of Edinburgh, euen as that ye tender the advancement of Goddis glorie, the saiftie of your brethren, and your awin assurance, togedder with the preservatioun of the Kirk in thir appearing daungers. . . . My gude hope is that nether flatterie nor fears sall mak you sa far to declyne fra Christ Jesus as that, against your publict promise and solempned band, ye will leave your brethren in sa just a cause.'

The letter fell into the Queen's hands; and Knox was accused of treason, on the ground that he had convoked the Queen's subjects. He was tried before the Council in the Queen's presence, and found innocent; and a General Assembly of the Church applauded his action.

It is interesting to note how the historians deal with this subject. Principal Robertson is clearly of opinion that Knox was wrong, though he passes no definite censure. He speaks of him as considering the zeal of

these persons (the two accused brethren) as laudable, their conduct meritorious, and themselves as sufferers in a good cause—a view which is clearly different from Robertson's own. He says of Knox's own acquittal: 'Happily for him, his judges were not only zealous Protestants, but the very men who, during the late commotions, had openly resisted and set at defiance the Queen's authority.' And he treats the whole incident as showing 'the low condition to which regal authority was then sunk, and the impunity with which subjects might invade those rights of the Crown which are now held sacred.' This, we submit, is the proper way of looking at the question. It was an act of war upon the Government, and it may be defended by its necessity and success as an incident in a rebellion. Prof. Hume Brown's defence of Knox is somewhat cynical.

'There was' (he says) 'a double reason why Knox should abide by his action. By admitting a breach of law he would have compromised the claim of the Church to assemble its members independent of the State. Knowing also the real mind of the Council, he could with some confidence reckon on an issue of the trial which might result in a triumph for the cause which he represented. . . . With real dexterity Knox turned his trial into a question between the two religions.'

A later biographer, Dr Cowan of Aberdeen, in a lucid, well informed, and moderate book, agrees with his predecessor in having no words of condemnation for a conspiracy to defeat the ends of justice, and speaks, with apparent approval, of Knox as having been 'practically forced to take a bold step, which to timid Protestants appeared dangerous, but was dictated, not by rash impulse, but by deliberate policy.' The whole story illustrates the essential weakness of Mary's position—her difficulty in obtaining even personal toleration, her inability to protect her own household or her own priests, and the impossibility of trying Knox on the merits of his case. Probably the Council were right in deciding that his action was not treason; but their decision was a foregone conclusion, and they insisted on dismissing Knox without even a reprimand. It was certainly 'real dexterity' on Knox's part to justify his action by the right of the Church to assemble its own members; and a

sentence in his original letter might be interpreted as a provision for this contingency. But there was no doubt of the purpose for which the brethren were convened; and the Queen failed in her effort to vindicate from violent intrusion her own chapel at Holyrood.

In the light of such facts as these it is difficult to accept the contention of Prof. Hume Brown and Dr Cowan that Knox's violence was justified by the extremity of the circumstances. It may be true that Mary entertained dangerous designs; but we are not convinced that she ever possessed power in the slightest degree adequate, not for their accomplishment, but even for their initiation. Even when she was for a moment successful, as when she married Darnley, an indication of her resentment at the persecution of an unfortunate priest who had said mass brought down upon her a rebuke such as few sovereigns have been forced to receive. The General Assembly sent to the Queen a remonstrance against the papistical and blasphemous mass, not only in the subjects, but in the Queen's Majesty's own person.

The murder of Rizzio was followed by a revival of Mary's power; but the character of Darnley was sure to render this only temporary. Knox's friendship with the murderers of Rizzio gave him some anxious weeks, spent, very rightly, out of Edinburgh, and was responsible for a long visit to England; but any real danger was soon over. That there are no certain grounds for accusing Knox of complicity in the crime, has been clearly shown by David Laing and Prof. Hume Brown; but there is still less ground for the latter's conjecture that 'of the manner in which the deed was done we may be certain that Knox would disapprove as vehemently as any of his contemporaries.' The fact is that Knox did not disapprove; on the contrary, he described it as 'a just act and worthy of all praise,' without any qualification, and lamented the banishment of the murderers 'now unworthely left of thare brethrein.' It is useless to try to smooth Knox down. Had he lived in the nineteenth century he would have been a different man. But the points in which we like him least—the ferocity at which we shudder, the dexterity, for which, in modern politics, we should find a harsher name—all these things are part of the man; and

he himself will be no party to hiding them. He leaves no room for an apologist; no man ever revealed himself more fully; no character in all our history demands so urgently to be judged by what he actually was. He felt no remorse, except that he had been too gentle in fighting the enemy; he had no hesitation about the value of his life-work; he was strong enough to recognise his own merits; and he died with the consciousness that he had done his duty as God's chosen instrument for the reformation of religion.

Of the books which appeared in the centenary year, the most important is unquestionably Mr Andrew Lang's 'John Knox and the Reformation,' which has provoked more pious indignation in Scotland than any work since Mr Henley's 'Essay on Burns.' The words in which Mr Lang describes the character of John Knox have frequently been quoted; but to understand his position it is necessary to quote them once more:—

'That Knox was a great man; a disinterested man; in his regard for the poor a truly Christian man; as a shepherd of Calvinistic souls, a man fervent and considerate; of pure life; in friendship loyal; by jealousy untainted; in private character genial and amiable, I am entirely convinced. In public and political life he was much less admirable; and his "History," vivacious as it is, must be studied as the work of an old-fashioned advocate rather than as the summing-up of a judge.'

These are not mere words introduced, as one of Mr Lang's critics courteously suggested, to disarm suspicion and put the reader into a sympathetic mood for the reception of some specially selected calumnies. Every phrase in this eulogy is based upon statements made in the chapters which follow it; and it is grossly unfair to Mr Lang to insinuate that his book is inspired by any other motive than to discover the truth. His work is a protest against the general unwillingness of his predecessors to face the facts. There are questions which still remain matter for debate; but, if the writing of history is of any use at all, Mr Lang ought to have succeeded in destroying at least one myth about Knox. The superstition that Knox was in any sense an apostle of toleration survived, in its infancy, the attack of the reviewer of 1816; and it is perhaps too much to hope that it will now

fall before the attack of Mr Lang, or rather of John Knox himself, for on this topic the biographer's simple duty has been to quote Knox's plain words.

That some such protest is still necessary is evident from two facts which illustrate the methods of previous writers. With regard to the death-penalty which the Convention Parliament of 1560 prescribed for a third hearing or celebrating of the mass, Mr Lang says:—

'The carnal mind would not gather exactly what the new penal laws were if it confined its study to the learned Dr McCrie's "Life of Knox." This erudite man, a pillar of the early Free Kirk, mildly remarks: "The Parliament . . . prohibited, under certain penalties, the celebration of the Mass." He leaves his readers to discover, in the Acts of Parliament and in Knox, what the "certain penalties" were.'

Now McCrie was not a pillar of the early Free Kirk; and Mr Lang's Scottish critics have written as if this slip of the pen disposed of his judgment of McCrie's work. That current Presbyterian teaching follows McCrie's lead is shown by a similar unwillingness, in so fair-minded a writer as Prof. Hume Brown, to state a disagreeable fact, however familiar to students it may be. After the massacre of St Bartholomew, when Protestant feeling was naturally excited, a Protestant convention 'drew up,' says Dr Hume Brown, 'a series of articles which, if not penned by Knox, must have been directly inspired by him. Public humiliation for the national sins, pains and penalties for those who preached the old religion—such were the recommendations of the first two articles.' The pains and penalties were that obstinate Catholics should be banished; and, if they declined to go, it should be lawful 'to invade them, and every one of them, to the death,' not only preachers, but hearers. It was natural, if unchristian, to desire vengeance upon Scottish Catholics for the terrible crime just committed in France; but this consideration fails to support the pleasant delusion that Knox and his followers were always (from our point of view) in the right, and that bloody-mindedness was confined to the wicked Papists. It is possible to justify this intolerance; in the prevailing ignorance of Scottish history it is possible to deny its existence without an immediate contradiction; and, in so logical a country as

Scotland, it is even possible to justify it and to deny it in the same speech. When these devices fail, Mr Lang may be described as anglicised; and the defence is considered complete. The idea that a defence is required for proposals to put Roman Catholics or infidels to death is, of course, a growth of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; but it is only on this point of actual persecution that toleration has been victorious. The speeches and sermons delivered on John Knox last year in Scotland were chiefly remarkable for extreme intolerance of new light of any sort.

From the point of view of the historian, the chief interest of Mr Lang's book lies, not in its emphasising obvious facts as to Knox's opinions, nor in its proof that Knox, as a politician, possessed the wisdom of the serpent and could meet the children of this world on their own ground, but in its criticism of his 'History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland,' and in its enquiry into the development of Knox's opinions on the question of the relations of Church and State. The 'History of the Reformation in Scotland' is unquestionably a great book. It is by far the best source of our knowledge of Knox himself; and it is a wonderfully graphic picture of the conflict in which he played so great a part. Its vigour and power have left their impress upon almost all subsequent writers; and its statements have been generally accepted as authoritative. It is in many ways a work of genius, and could have been written only by a man of almost heroic personality. Nevertheless we do not understand why Mr Lang's description of it as 'the work of an old-fashioned advocate' should have given so much offence. For how could it be other? It was written, at the fiercest moment of the conflict, by the most determined leader of the revolutionary party, with the intent that it should serve as a political pamphlet. Human nature does not permit of moderation in such writing; and Knox, accustomed to rouse and to sway violent outbursts of popular passion, would have regarded moderation as the sin of Meroz.

The moderate man does not come to the help of the Lord against the mighty; and the work of Knox is marked by an entire absence of self-restraint. Knox saw no reason why he should not call his enemies bloody,

stinking, rotten; why he should not level at them any accusation which lay ready to hand; or why he should not give free play to his vein of coarse humour, so long as the joke was on his own side. Believing as he did that the idolater should die the death, he did not hesitate to give expression to his enjoyment of their fate. 'These things we write merrily,' he said in his account of the murder of Cardinal Beaton. The judgment of God had been fulfilled. It is as when Weir of Hermiston indignantly asks: 'I was glad to get Jopp haangit, and what for would I pretend I wasna?' Merrily, too, he reported indecent gossip; often it does not seem humorous to us, but taste in these matters changes. Not that Knox's taste in humour was universal even in his age; it has been pointed out by more than one writer that some of Knox's contemporaries did not write in this vein.

The style of the book and the passionate vehemence of its invective ought to prepare us to find other faults inseparable from such a work. A learned nineteenth century antiquary, Joseph Robertson, agreed with Lord Hailes as to 'how little Knox's statements in his "History" are to be relied on even in matters which were within the reformer's own knowledge'; but the warning passed unheeded. Mr Lang's criticism of the 'History' has been condemned as 'pertinent only if addressed to those who do not know what original authorities are'; but the fact remains that those who ought to know what original authorities are have insisted on disregarding ordinary canons in their treatment of this book, and that Mr Lang is the first to offer anything like a systematic criticism of it. He raises a number of interesting questions, from which we select three as indicative of the necessity of treating the book as an *ex parte* statement, important and indeed invaluable, but not the verdict of a final court of appeal.

It is becoming common to argue that the destruction of the great religious houses and the cathedrals of Scotland was not brought about by the Reformation mobs. In a very narrow sense there is truth in the statement; no mere mob can actually destroy a great building by mere plundering; but the destruction was none the less the result of the Reformation. The opposite view has, however, been supported by a frequently

quoted passage in Knox's 'History,' in which he asserts that the destruction of the monasteries at Perth was the work, 'not of the gentilmen, neyther of thame that war earnest professoris, bot of the raschall multitude.' But, as Mrs MacCunn, in her excellent little 'Life' of Knox, pointed out for the first time, the prophet, in a private letter written at the time, gives the sole credit to the brethren, and adds a detail (important in connexion with the relations between the Queen Regent and the Protestants), that priests were commanded to cease from their blasphemous mass under pain of death. Prof. Cowan, who usually faces honestly and fairly whatever may reasonably be said against Knox, attempts to escape from this difficulty by saying in a footnote: 'Knox, in his "History," gives his deliberate opinion of those who took part in the work of destruction. In a letter written soon after the events related, he had unadvisedly included them among the brethren.' But the letter clearly shows that Knox entirely sympathised; and, long as it is, it contains no hint of the existence of a rascal multitude at all. On the contrary he remarks that 'the thirst of the poore people, als weill as of the nobilitie heir, is wonderous great; which putteth me in comfort, that Christ Jesus sall triumphe for a space heir, in the north and extreme parts of the earth.' If language has any meaning at all, Knox in this letter accepted the responsibility for the destruction of the monasteries.

The other two instances have reference to accusations of falsehood against the Queen Regent. Probably the best known lie in Scottish history—and there are not a few—is the breach of faith attributed to Mary of Guise in breaking a promise made to an assembly of Protestants at Perth in May 1559. It appears in every account of the Scottish Reformation; and Mary's grandson, James VI, was taught it so carefully by George Buchanan that he referred to it more than once. Mr Lang has shown that, in all probability, Mary did not lie at all. The sole evidence against her is the statement of Knox, whose correspondence is here consistent with his 'History.' But in the contemporary communications with England, in an almost certainly contemporary 'Historie of the Estate of Scotland,' strongly Protestant in sympathy, and in the 'Catholic History of Bishop Lesley,' there is no

suggestion of perfidy; and the two latter authorities agree in an alternative explanation. Mr Lang thus sums up the question: 'We have seen throughout that Knox vilifies Mary of Guise in cases where she is blameless. On the other hand Knox is our only witness who was at Perth at the time of the events; and it cannot be doubted that what he told Mrs Locke was what he believed, whether correctly or erroneously.' In the circumstances, Mary of Guise deserves, we think, to have the benefit of the doubt; and that benefit must of necessity be admitted, unless we are prepared to regard Knox's statements as absolutely conclusive.

The remaining example is, in some ways, similar. In July 1559 a truce was negotiated between Mary of Guise and the Lords of the Congregation. The actual terms exist in Teulet, and in the English 'Foreign Calendar.' 'These,' says Mr Lang, 'were the terms accepted by the Congregation. This is certain, not only because historians, Knox excepted, are unanimous, but because the terms were either actually observed, or were evaded, on a stated point of construction.' Knox, on the other hand, gives a list of 'the heads drawn by us which we desired to be granted,' and asserts that 'these our articles were altered' by the Queen's party. The Congregation issued a proclamation in which their original demands were given as the settlement agreed upon; and Knox justified this action on the ground that

'we proclamed nathing whiche was nocht finallie aggreit uponn in word and promeiss betwix us and thame with quhame the appointment was maid, whatsoevir thair scribeis had efter writtin, quha in verray deid had alterit, bayth in wordis and sentenceis, oure Articles, as thay war first consavit; and yitt, gif thair awin writtingis war diligentlie examinitt, the self same thing sall be found in substance'—

an allegation the truth of which has not been established by the actual examination of these writings. Knox admits that, in proclaiming to the Congregation the terms agreed on, his party deliberately omitted the clauses favourable to the Regent. This, too, he justifies. 'To proclame anything in thair favouris, we thoct it nocht necessarie, knowing that in that behalf thay thame selfis sould be diligent anewch.' Accordingly, in the

account of the treaty sent to England by the Congregation, these clauses were likewise omitted. There is an admitted economy of truth here, a piece of sharp practice which shows how impossible was the Regent's task; and, in the light of all that we can gather from other sources, it is not easy to accept Knox's statement that Mary of Guise deliberately falsified the terms.

What then are we to conclude with regard to the credibility of Knox's 'History'? Is it a conscious attempt to give a partial version of the whole story, to poison the sources of the stream of historical knowledge? To say anything of this kind would be to go, as it seems to us, much too far. The difficulty of ascertaining the truth in modern controversies; the impossibility of reconciling statements of eye-witnesses as to events of yesterday; the varying versions, given by living men, of events, and especially of conversations, in which they themselves took part—all these and similar considerations must guide us to a final verdict. That Knox repeated current slanders with absolute recklessness is, we think, undeniable; that he frequently acted on the principle that to proclaim anything in favour of the enemy was unnecessary, is also evident. His view of his duty in this connexion may be paralleled by Samuel Johnson's notion of historical reporting: 'I saved appearances well enough, but I took good care that the Whig dogs should not have the best of it.' That his recollection, even of recent events, should be sometimes quite untrustworthy is not surprising, in view of the nature of the conflict in which he was engaged. Such lapses of memory are not unknown even in modern politics.

The 'History' affords examples of a sharp practice less innocent in our eyes, but, as we have said, inevitable in an age when the sole business of a controversialist was to blacken the enemy. The three examples which we have quoted do not seem to us to belong to this last category; they are explicable on the supposition of misunderstanding and lapse of memory. When Knox wrote about the rascal multitude at Perth, he had come to disapprove, and, as Mr Lang has shown, he knew that Calvin strongly disapproved, such outrages; and he himself had, he tells us, in other cases condemned them. It is a reasonable supposition that he may have persuaded

himself that at Perth the godly had used their influence to restrain the mob. In the other two instances there remains a possibility of honest mistake based upon verbal communications. Knox's belief that the Regent told a lie at Perth in May 1559 was possibly the result of a remark of the Regent about 'taking some better order.' It must be remembered, not only that Knox, in writing his 'History,' was extremely anxious to justify a breach of contract on the part of the Congregation by alleging a prior breach of faith on the other side, but also that, from the first, he was fully prepared, and even eager, to find in the Regent's conduct such deliberate deceit. Starting from the assumption that the idolatress would lie, he readily found his foresight justified. With regard to the false treaty of July 1559, Mr Lang, who is nearly always fair to Knox, himself suggests an explanation which Prof. Cowan is inclined to adopt. Knox's obscure remark, 'We proclaimed nothing which was not finally agreed upon in word and promise,' may possibly point to an inaccurate report of a conversation between the Protestants and two nobles of the Queen's party, Chatelherault and Huntly. We agree with Mr Lang in seeing

'no explanation of Knox's conduct, except that he and his friends pacified their consciences by persuading themselves that non-official words of Huntly and Chatelherault (whatever these words may have been), spoken "after all was agreed upon," cancelled the treaty with the Regent, became the real treaty, and were binding on the Regent. . . . So great . . . is a good man's power of self-persuasion.'

Some such defence as this can be made in other instances where Mr Lang has impugned Knox's accuracy; and such a defence is not merely the result of an unwillingness to attribute wanton falsehood to Knox; it is essential that we should be able to make it if we are still to regard his 'History' as in any sense an authority at all. Almost any self-deception is possible when the *odium theologicum* is at its height; and there is an amount of self-deception in Knox's 'History' large enough to prevent its being quoted as a final authority in any instance where the reputation of Knox's friends or of his enemies is concerned. Is there any other work of a similar character of which the same must not be said?

Can the writings of Wycliffe, of Clarendon, of Burnet be unhesitatingly accepted as decisive evidence? And it must be remembered that Knox was the contemporary and the friend of the most shameless historical liar who ever wrote on British soil—George Buchanan, whose memory is being honoured this year in Scotland, and deservedly, for he is one of the very few Scottish humanists whose names are known outside their own country.

Mr Lang's learned and suggestive book is also of importance in relation to the development of Knox's views on the relations of Church and State, a subject treated with vigour and insight by Mr Mathieson in his 'Politics and Religion from the Reformation to the Revolution,' a valuable study in Scottish history, which appeared some three years before Mr Lang's work on Knox. Mr Mathieson lays stress upon the doctrine, stated by Knox in the Confession of Faith of 1560, that magistrates are God's lieutenants, not only for civil government, but also for the maintenance of true religion; and he points out that it involved the absorption of the State by the Church in the event of a difference of opinion, for the court of appeal in any such difference was the word of God as interpreted by the Church. This dogma has led to ecclesiastical revolutions even in the nineteenth century; but the danger arising from it was immeasurably greater at a time when the Protestant clergy claimed the power of loosing and binding on earth and in heaven, and when their terrible sentence of excommunication (which might be pronounced for what they were pleased to consider contumacy) carried with it the cessation of human intercourse and the forfeiture of legal rights.

The question remains as to whether the Church was justified in appealing to arms when its differences with the State became fundamental, and Mr Lang has traced the sequence of Knox's opinions upon this point. We have seen that in Scotland, under Mary Stuart, he held that the godly might even proceed to the 'execution' (i.e. assassination) of the idolatrous ruler. In England, under Edward VI, he had held a contrary view, and warned his congregation at Berwick to remember always 'that dew obedience be given to magistrates, reulars and princes, without tumult, grudge or seditioun; for, how wicked yat evir themselves be in life, or how ungodlie that evir thair

precepts or commandements be, ye most obey thame for conscience sake; except in chief poynts of relligioun, and then aught ye rather to obey God nor man.'

But even in this case it is to be only passive resistance, for he adds:—

'Not to pretend to defend Godd's treuthe or relligioun (ye being subgetts) by violence or sweirde, but patiently suffering what God shall please be laid upon you for constante confession of your fayth and believe.'

These views were in accordance with the ideas of Knox's master, Calvin, who refused his sanction to the rebellion of the Huguenots. 'Better that we all perish a hundred times than that the name of Christianity and the Gospel should come under such disgrace.' After the accession of Mary Tudor, Knox attempted to get from Henry Bullinger, of Zürich, a general admission of the right of resistance to an idolatrous sovereign; but Bullinger would give no definite opinion, wisely saying that everything depended upon the particular circumstances, and warning his correspondent that 'other objects are often aimed at under the pretext of a just and necessary assertion or maintenance of right, and the worst characters mix themselves with the good'—possibly a reference to Northumberland's rebellion in the preceding year, of which Knox had not approved.

From this time Knox was reluctant to consult continental reformers, and once declined to do so when he was asked to write to Calvin, whose views on obedience and on the destruction of religious buildings were not those of the Scottish Calvinists. During this period he adopted his strong views on the duty of the Church in the rooting out of idolaters. In old age, after Mary was a prisoner in England, Knox's general view was slightly altered, although he never ceased to demand Mary's death. He acquiesced in an establishment of quasi-Episcopacy in Scotland, and he advised the English Puritans to remain in the Church, and warned them not to 'damn all for false prophets and heretics that agree not with us in our apparel and other opinions.' It may be arguable whether this position is or is not consistent with other opinions of Knox; but the consistency of the aged Reformer, with, as he himself said, one foot in the grave, is a small

matter; if he was milder than of old, it was right that he should be so. But the important point is that not this sane and statesmanlike doctrine, but the wilder outbursts of his pen were accepted as his testament by a large section of the Church which looks upon him as its founder. 'Knox,' says Mr Mathieson, 'was the first dissenter; and we shall find his spiritual progeny dissenting, abjuring, and protesting at every stage of the Church's history.' This is a main thesis of Mr Mathieson's book, and it represents one side of Knox's work. But we cannot accept it as a complete statement; nor indeed is it meant to be taken absolutely. Knox was not a consistent prophet; and that section of the Church of Scotland which, under Spottiswoode and the Forbeses, Leighton and Carstares, Robertson and Pirie, has acted on the wise principles delivered by Knox to his English congregation in the early days of his ministry, and to the English Puritans who consulted him in its closing years, may claim a share in his heritage.

Some of Mr Lang's conclusions about Knox have been anticipated by Mrs MacCunn in a work mentioned at the head of this article. She has more sympathy with her subject than Mr Lang; she feels the fascination of his rough geniality as well as of his intellectual power; and she understands better than Robert Louis Stevenson the real nature of Knox's friendship with the devout and fearful mothers in Israel, whose correspondence with him forms an interesting study in religious psychology. It is a womanly book, and, like her volume on Mary Stuart published last year, is full of a delicate insight for which 'feminine' is not a sufficiently descriptive word. There are, of course, passages for which 'feminine' will do well enough—as when Knox's reference to his bride as 'my own flesh' is condemned as 'an ungraceful image' (though the imagery is not Knox's), or when she remarks that 'the testamentary part of his will shows that Knox had that practical mastery of his private economies without which no man can have perfect freedom for the things of the spirit'—a view probably held by Mrs Knox, and certainly by Xantippe.

Mrs MacCunn's volume on Mary is the first attempt to write a biography of the Queen in the light of the new material rendered available in Father Pollen's 'Papal

Negotiations with Mary, Queen of Scots, and Mr Lang's 'Mystery of Mary Stuart,' the value of which has been already discussed in the pages of the 'Quarterly Review' (January 1902). Mrs MacCunn's book has, unfortunately, no references, and contains a few, a very few, verbal slips; but it is a scholarly piece of work, and its style renders it the best biography of Mary that we possess. The author has no doubt about the Queen's share in the murder of Darnley; and she makes use occasionally of statements against Mary which are drawn from very suspicious documents, as if their credibility was unquestioned, thus exaggerating the effect of the cumulative argument which tells most strongly against the Queen. But her book is so sympathetic, and her note of sympathy rings so true, that even those who do not share her settled conviction of Mary's guilt cannot fail to recognise that she has produced a book which ought to live long after the present stage of the controversy has been passed.

The literature of the Knox centenary is disappointing in the absence of any attempt to sum up the Reformer's work and character and influence in the light of the most recent research. The nearest approach to this is Prof. Cowan's learned and moderate biography, which is specially notable for its clear exposition of theological doctrine and ecclesiastical polity. But we still await a dispassionate discussion of the real value of the Knoxian Reformation and of Knox's share in bringing it about. Was it necessary that it should be of so extreme a character? Was there no *media via* between the complete failure and the absolute triumph of Calvinism? Were the views on doctrine, on ritual, on government, adopted by Knox, the best for Scotland? How far has the country suffered by their partial abandonment in the seventeenth century? how far by further departures from the principles of the documents which superseded Knox's as the 'standards' of the Church? What has been the effect upon the national character of the great change of 1560? These and similar questions have never been honestly faced by writers on Scottish history, or treated on broad and general lines; many writers have gallantly commenced the task, but have been led away by the interest of the narrative itself, or by the sentiment *pro aris et focis*, or sometimes by the zest of attacking ortho-

dox opinions, and so have descended from the judgment bench to the advocate's standpoint. Perhaps it is as well that, in a year when the current of ecclesiastical and political controversy was flowing more strongly than usual, no such attempt was made; but the task is one which might well be undertaken before the real quatercentenary of the birth of Knox.

Nor does it seem to us that the recent writers have done justice to the genuine humility of the man, which stands in striking contrast to the arrogance of the prophet. It is not merely that he indulged in those phrases of extreme self-abasement in public and private devotion which were becoming the conventional language for the confession of sin, and which, from the generality of their terms and the violence of their assertions, tended to obscure the moral perspective and to paralyse the conscience. To accuse oneself of sins which one has not committed is, as Knox told his mother-in-law, a sin against God who has granted safety from them. The genuine humility of the man is to be traced rather in his dependence upon human friendship and brotherhood, never better expressed than in the often-quoted words, 'Of nature I am churlish, and in conditions different from many; yet one thing I ashame not to affirm, that familiarity once thoroughly contracted was never yet broken in my default. The cause may be that I have rather need of all than that any have need of me'—a 'golden sentence,' in Mrs MacCunn's happy phrase.

His mother-in-law, Mrs Bowes, suffered from religious hypochondria; and a long series of letters bears witness to Knox's wisdom and patience in ministering to an innocent mind diseased. His enemies talked scandal; and Knox very properly at once published a portion of the correspondence, and told the whole truth about their relationship, writing in words which neither deserved Stevenson's ungenerous censure nor required the apology of some of his biographers. 'Her company to me was comfortable (yea, honourable and profitable, for she was to me and myne a mother); but yet it was not without some croce; for besydes trouble and fasherie of body susteyned for her, my mynd was seldom quyet, for doing somewhat for the comfort of her troubled conscience., He made it clear that 'her tentation was not in the fleshe'

nor for anything that apperteyned to the fleshe, but it was in spirit'; and such ghostly conflicts were matter, not for shame, but for pride; Knox himself was privileged to have such a wrestling of the spirit on his deathbed. As we read the letters we wonder how to John Knox the company of Elizabeth Bowes was 'comfortable and profitable'; but the letters themselves prove that it was no mere form of words.

His secretary's minute account of his last hours throw a flood of light upon the charm of this churlish man. He 'laid him down with a will,' paying his servant twenty shillings beyond his wages, 'for thou wilt never get no moir of me in this lyfe,' and ordering a hogshead of wine to be broached for two of his friends, urging them to send for it 'so long as it lasted, for he wald never tarie till it were drunkin.' Like the prophet Samuel, whom in many ways he resembles, he left on record a statement of his innocency in the great place he had filled. 'Nane I haif corrupted; nane I haif defraudit; merchandise haif I not maid.' It was no vain boast. With clean hands and a pure heart he was about to ascend into the hill of God, free from the reproach of selfishness and greed which mars the character of his allies and his followers.

To his erstwhile friend, Kirkaldy of Grange, now holding out in the Castle for Queen Mary, in defiance of Knox's warnings, he sent this last message: 'Signifie to the Laird that Johne Knox remainis the same man, now going to die, that ever he has herd him befoir, quhen he was able of body.' In his dying words there is a consciousness of a great work achieved, and a duty simply performed, although he would hear no tribute of praise from those about his bed. As a public teacher he had used the words of God freely and boldly, and, as we should think to-day, presumptuously. But, as he lay dying, when he tried to utter the familiar sentences of the Lord's Prayer, he paused after the first petition and asked, 'Who can pronounce so holie wordis?' The exclamation reveals an innate reverence which years of bitter controversy had obscured, but not destroyed. But a minute later the ruling passion had reasserted itself, and he repeated the whole prayer with a paraphrase upon each clause. His last advice to his friends sums up the religious side of his teaching, freed from the political and ecclesiastical

tenets of his party: 'Live in Christ, and let never fleshe fear death.'

His loss was mourned by a small band of the faithful; but the country, as a whole, failed to realise the significance of his death. There was no national outburst of grief, no lament as for 'the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof.' Even the admiring James Melville is not clear about the date; and the Edinburgh citizen whose 'Diurnal of Occurrents' has come down to us, wrote down this condemnation on hearing the news: 'John Knox, minister, deceased, who had, as was alleged, the most part of the blame of all the sorrows of Scotland since the slaughter of the late Cardinal.' He lies buried in the old churchyard of St Giles', now the Parliament Square, close to an equestrian statue of Charles II, a whimsical incongruity which would seem to indicate that the rulers of Restoration Edinburgh agreed with this contemporary estimate of the work of the Reformer. But the Restoration Government was unquestionably out of sympathy with the national feeling; and the Revolution which displaced it in 1689 was, in some measure, the work of the dead man who lay at the feet of Charles II. Knox himself, like his great enemy, Mary Stuart, made his appeal to the judgment of posterity: 'What I have been to my country, albeit this unthankful age will not know, yet the ages to come will be compelled to bear witness to the truth.' The stage of compulsion has long been passed; it is with gratitude, and even with affection, that Knox is remembered to-day; and no one among 'men renowned for their power, giving counsel by their understanding, has a surer or a more righteous hold upon the reverence of his countrymen than John Knox. 'The days of the life of men may be numbered, but the days of Israel are innumerable. A wise man shall inherit glory among his people, and his name shall be perpetual.'

R S. RAIT.

Art. IX.—THE ORIGIN AND HISTORICAL BASIS OF
THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

1. *The Oxford Movement.* By R. W. Church, Dean of St Paul's. London: Macmillan, 1891.
2. *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey, D.D.* By H. P. Liddon. Four vols. London: Longmans, 1893.
3. *Tracts for the Times.* By members of the University of Oxford. Six vols. London: Rivingtons, 1838–42.
And other works.

In the judgments passed on the character and meaning of ritualistic practices, and on the views and intentions of those who use them, insufficient attention is frequently paid to the consideration that a large number of these practices have an historical basis; and that those who use them are often actuated by ideas and motives which may be classed as historical. That in many instances—in what proportion it is impossible to say—these practices are regarded as having a symbolical or doctrinal significance, and are valued solely or principally on this account; that in some instances, though probably few in number, they are valued as tending to assimilate the usages of the English Church to those of the Church of Rome, or at least as tending towards that unity of forms and teaching which many churchmen of various shades of thought desire; that in others they are regarded as desirable from a sense of order or from the æsthetic point of view—all this is undoubtedly true. But a fair consideration of the history of the last seventy years points to the conclusion that ideas such as these do not lie at the base of the Ritualistic movement, still less of the so-called Tractarian or Oxford movement out of which it sprang; that they do not form the sole or even the principal motive which actuated the early Tractarians, or which influences their successors in the present day; and that to suggest this is to misunderstand the facts, and seriously to misconceive the strength and importance of the Ritualistic movement.

It is unnecessary to dwell at length upon the causes which reduced the influences of religion in the English Church to so low an ebb as they reached in the early

years of the last century ; but the conditions then existing require a brief attempt at explanation. The religious and political turmoil of the sixteenth century, while it removed many abuses, gave us a reformed Church, and opened the way for the teaching of the great Anglican divines of the next two hundred years, dealt a severe shock to the religious spirit of the country. In some quarters it induced a tendency to fanaticism, in others a lukewarmness or even indifference in matters of religion. The cupidity of Elizabethan courtiers threatened further disendowment, and inspired a general sense of insecurity. The necessity of holding the balance between Romanists and Puritans alienated from the Church considerable sections of the community ; and the secessions of Presbyterians and Independents deprived her of many members in whose hearts religion held the first place. Many livings were unfilled ; there were constant complaints of an 'unlearned clergy' ; pluralities and other abuses multiplied ; and, in spite of the labours and devotion of such men as Jewel, Bilson, and Hooker, the Church, on the whole, lost ground with the nation.

In the early part of the seventeenth century this state of things showed little improvement upon the whole. The Episcopate was indeed more learned and more spiritual ; the name of Andrewes would have been an ornament to any age ; but the danger of schism or of the break-up of the English Church increased with the growth of High-church tendencies on one side and of the Puritan opposition on the other. The Court of High Commission, now the organ of a despotic Government, brought the Church itself into disrepute ; the weakening of Calvinistic tenets among the hierarchy, and the growth of Arminianism, 'that sovereign drug,' roused widespread suspicion ; and the Laudian revival, however well-intentioned and intrinsically estimable, still further weakened the Episcopate through what was erroneously regarded as its tendency to Rome. The Civil War was largely, indeed primarily, a religious war ; and religious wars have always been detrimental to religion. The triumph of the Parliament meant the fall of the Church. Though Cromwell and many of his supporters were religious men, the religious organisation of the State was, for the time being, shattered ; and the hold of the Church upon

the nation received a blow from which it has never wholly recovered.

After the Restoration, though the Church regained its legal and political position, the evil could not be undone; nor was the spirit of the times such as to render a general revival of religion easy, or even possible. Not even the writings of Hammond and Sanderson, Taylor and Barrow, could stem the tide of hostility or indifference, or restore to the Church her former influence with the people at large. Many of the clergy who held livings under the Commonwealth were, through the Act of Uniformity (1662), ejected from their cures, and it was difficult to supply their places. The country clergy were, as a rule, poor and illiterate. The prosecution of Nonconformity made few proselytes, and roused bitter hostility. On the other hand, the reaction against Puritan restrictions, and the character of the Court and the aristocracy, induced a moral laxity which affected all classes. Carelessness about religion succeeded to fanaticism. The political action of the Church in supporting Charles II in his struggle with Parliament alienated the partisans of parliamentary government; and confidence thus shaken was hardly revived by her opposition to the ecclesiastical policy of his brother James.

Too late to conciliate Nonconformist hostility, the Revolution of 1688 grudgingly introduced the principle of toleration; but all attempts at 'comprehension' decisively failed. The schism of the Nonjurors made a deplorable breach in the ranks of Anglicanism, damaged the reputation of the Church, and deprived her of the services of many able and conscientious persons, both lay and clerical, including such prelates as Sancroft and Ken. During the eighteenth century religious conditions cannot be said to have improved, if indeed they did not grow worse. It is true that there were some signs of a religious revival at the outset, such as the establishment of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and the foundation of charity schools; but these were far from outweighing obstacles on the other side. The Church came more and more to appear as a political machine, a mere organ of government; its high places were regarded as providing dignities and incomes for the cadets

of great families. Learning, speaking generally, though there were some striking exceptions, dwindled; and this was but natural when it was slighted in high places. In the latter part of the century no less a witness than Dr Johnson confesses that 'no man can now be made a bishop for his learning and piety; his only chance for promotion is his being connected with some one who has parliamentary interest.' In 1717 Convocation ceased to meet. For nearly a century and a half aristocratic principles prevailed in Church as well as State, and the voice of the Church, as a whole, was dumb. Public discussion was stifled; and reform, whether of doctrine or of practice, was rendered proportionately difficult. The disputes of High and Low Church, Whig and Tory, divided and weakened the Establishment. The practical common-sense philosophy of the day favoured latitudinarianism, and discouraged everything that could be stigmatised as 'enthusiasm.' The doctrines of Hoadly were favoured by the Whig Government. Sovereigns like the first two of the Hanoverian line, ministers like Walpole, Newcastle, and North, could not stimulate the higher clergy to a sense of their moral and spiritual responsibilities.

The age, though sane and vigorous, was coarse and material. Though there was much religious controversy, the 'enlightenment,' of which in some departments the century could justly boast, did not touch religion or illuminate the masses. Education was neglected; the universities were undistinguished. Non-residence, pluralities, and other abuses abounded. Bishop Hoadly, it is said, did not visit his diocese once in six years. Bishop Watson, who wrote the 'Apology for the Bible,' held sixteen livings in addition to his see. 'The clergy' (wrote Doddridge) 'were courtiers, politicians, lawyers, merchants, usurers, civil magistrates, sportsmen, musicians, stewards of country squires, tools of men in power.' Originality was hardly to be found in the Church save in the author of the 'Analogy'; learning such as that of Edmund Gibson, Lowth, and Horsley was very rare; William Law was a voice crying in the wilderness. Montesquieu, on his visit to England, remarks that in higher circles 'everyone laughs if one talks of religion.' Later in the century Dr Johnson, if we are to believe Boswell, declared that he had never met a 'religious clergyman'; and

Blackstone, speaking of the sermons of his day, affirmed that, in church after church, 'it would have been impossible to discover whether the preacher were a follower of Confucius, of Mahomet, or of Christ.'

The caricatures of Hogarth and Rowlandson show into what disrespect the clergy as a whole had fallen, and how conventional and somnolent the ministrations of the Church had become. The fabrics were allowed to sink into decay; in the sixty years of George III's reign, when London was growing fast, only six new churches were built in the capital; the average country parson hardly differed in habits, culture, and tone of life from the farmers among whom he lived. In many districts, especially those in which industries such as mining were carried on, the population lived in a state of practical heathendom; and, when the progress of manufactures began to collect masses of people in the large towns, little or nothing was done by the Church to improve their spiritual condition. The law, so far as the poor and the criminal were concerned, was barbarous; and such attempts as were made to mitigate its brutality did not emanate from those to whom the Founder of the Church committed the special charge of sinners and the poor. The whole life and teaching of John Wesley were a protest against this state of things. Yet, though his labours showed the grievous and general need of reform, he got nothing but discouragement from those in high places; and the secession of his numerous followers came near to leaving the Church of England the Church of the rich, the well-born, and the corruptible.

In the latter half of the eighteenth century the Evangelical movement gave a great stimulus to devotion, and ushered in a better state of things. Taken in its wider sense, so as to include the followers of Wesley and Whitefield, this movement led to another, the last great secession from the Church. The Evangelicals, properly so-called, who remained within the Church, fought for many years a gallant and almost desperate fight against the apathy and materialism which surrounded them. It is noteworthy that their leaders all belonged to the lower ranks of the clergy, and received little or no countenance from their spiritual superiors. Their influence grew steadily but slowly; so slowly that the author of the

'History of the Church Missionary Society' is constrained to confess that, in the last decade of the eighteenth century, 'the revival movement had not yet leavened the Church at large,' and that its supporters were 'but a small minority despised or hated by most Churchmen.' To them, however, is due the undying credit of having begun, in dark days, the great work of Church reform.

Several other signs which we can now see to have heralded a great change were already appearing on the horizon. During the early years of the last century a new conception of the value of history, an awakened interest in things ancient and mediæval, began to stir the air. More thorough and scientific methods of historical investigation were being applied. Under the Record Commissions of 1800, 1806, 1825, and 1831 many important historical records had been published; and the calendaring and publication of state documents was being actively prosecuted. Learned societies were unearthing the historical treasures hitherto buried in public and private libraries throughout the kingdom. Between the years 1812 and 1842 the Bannatyne, Camden, English Historical, Irish Archæological, Maitland, Parker, Percy, Roxburghe, Spalding, Surtees, and other historical or historico-literary societies were founded; and their prolific activity showed the wide prevalence of the historical spirit and the increased interest now taken in the records of the past. The work of such men as Hallam, Arnold, Thirlwall, Kemble, Palgrave, Ellis, Nicolas, Giles, Duffus Hardy, and others, was throwing a flood of light on the Middle Ages and more ancient times. The Oxford Press was issuing its editions of Strype, Burnet, and other valuable historical writers.

In literature the writings of Sir Walter Scott and Coleridge, of Chateaubriand and Victor Hugo, the criticism of Lamb and Hazlitt, the revived study of Shakespeare, Chaucer, and other early authors, the growing interest in Anglo-Saxon and Middle English, the nascent science of comparative philology, all tended, by calling attention to the past, to give a vigorous impulse to the historical side of the Romantic movement, soon to be developed in various directions by Ruskin, Tennyson, and Carlyle. In the arts, especially in architecture, the same tendency is to be seen. Pugin and his followers, studying

and imitating medieval models, embodied in their buildings the spirit of the Gothic revival, anticipated by Horace Walpole and stimulated by Goethe in his remarks on Strassburg Cathedral and other writings; the Camden (architectural) Society was founded at Cambridge with cognate objects (1839); and the restoration and decoration of churches and cathedrals, under the influence of religious, historical, and artistic motives, displayed, if not always wisely, the revived interest in and love of the monuments of the past.

It was under influences and in the midst of tendencies such as these that, about 1833, the Oxford movement began. That movement originated in the desire to spiritualise religion, to infuse warmth and reality into devotion, to energise the Church, and to render it more acceptable to the mass of the people. It was, as Liddon has remarked in his 'Life of Pusey,' 'a completion of the earlier revival of religion known as Evangelical,' a revival which, with all its spiritualising and energising power, was imperfect in that it laid a too exclusive stress on the individual and neglected the corporate life of the spiritual society to which he belongs.

'The Oxford movement' (says Dean Church) 'was, on the one hand, theological, on the other, resolutely practical. . . . Theologically it dealt with great questions of religious principle. What is the Church? Is it a reality or a mode of speech? On what grounds does it rest? How may it be known? . . . On the other hand, the movement was marked by its deep earnestness on the practical side of genuine Christian life.'

The preface to the 'Tracts for the Times' at once summarises existing defects and indicates the methods by which it was sought to revive the religious spirit.

'Methodism and Popery' (say the projectors of the series) 'are in different ways the refuge of those to whom the Church stints the gifts of grace; they are the foster-mothers of abandoned children. The neglect of the daily service, the desecration of festivals, the Eucharist scantily administered, insubordination permitted in all ranks of the Church, orders and offices imperfectly developed, the want of societies for particular religious objects, and the like deficiencies, lead the feverish mind, desirous of a vent to its feelings and a stricter

rule of life, to the smaller religious communities, to prayer and Bible meetings, and ill-advised institutions and societies on the one hand; on the other, to the solemn and captivating services by which Popery gains its proselytes.'

The conception which lay at the base of the Tractarian movement was that of the Holy Catholic Church, bound together by a spiritual unity, though visibly divided into national and other churches. This conception drew with it, as an inevitable corollary, the notion of ecclesiastical continuity, of the intimate and unbroken connexion between the Primitive Church and the Church of England, and of the importance of the Fathers as guides and teachers for churchmen in the present day. It also tended to emphasise points of communion rather than points of difference between the churches; and, while by no means desiring to pass over the Reformation or to undo its work, to prove that the reforms of the sixteenth century did not imply a total breach with the past. In a word, the practical end in view was to be promoted by the diffusion of ideas resting largely upon an historical basis, enlisting the aid of the past to vitalise and inspire the present and the future. These facts may be abundantly illustrated from the writings and incidents of the time.

The Rev. T. Sikes, of Guilsborough, one of the forerunners of the movement, is quoted by Pusey, in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury (1842), as having said:

'I see among the clergy a number of very amiable and estimable men . . . but I have observed one universal want in their teaching, the uniform suppression of one great truth. There is no account given anywhere, so far as I can see, of the One Holy Catholic Church. . . . Now this great truth is an article of the Creed. . . . We now hear not a breath about the Church. By and by those who live to see it will hear of nothing else.'

The central idea of Keble's Assize Sermon (preached on July 14, 1833), which Newman and others regarded as the true starting-point of the Oxford movement, is a combination of the spiritual nature of the Church, as a divine institution, with its historical continuity, both characteristics being, in the author's view, endangered by encroachments of the secular power. He speaks of 'a nation, having for centuries acknowledged, as an essential

part of its theory of government, that, as a Christian nation, she is also a part of Christ's Church, and bound in all her legislation and policy by the fundamental rules of that Church.' The general attitude of the leaders in this respect is again illustrated in Keble's sermon on Primitive Tradition, in which he says: 'The freedom of the Anglican Church may be vindicated against the exorbitant claims of Rome, and yet no disparagement ensue of the authority inherent to the Catholic Apostolick Church.' Hugh James Rose, in his sermon on 'The Churchman's Duty,' preached four days after Keble's Assize Sermon, says:

'There are two points of view in which our National Church must be looked at—as a religious establishment, and in the far higher character of a member of Christ's Holy Catholic Church.'

William Palmer's 'Treatise on the Church of Christ' (1838) dwells at greater length on the same views.

It is needless to point out that the poetry of 'The Christian Year,' which was regarded by Pusey and Newman at the time as *fons et origo mali* ('Life of Pusey,' i, 271), is largely inspired by the same ideas, recurring frequently to the primary notion of the Catholic Church, and drawing its illustrations impartially from Old and New Testament and from the annals of primitive Christianity. The 'Lyra Apostolica' (1836), to which Keble, Newman, Hurrell, Froude and others contributed, gives expression to the same central thought, though, generally speaking, in a somewhat more austere and even a militant tone. A sonnet from the 'Lyra,' by J. W. Bowden, illustrates the attitude of the contributors in this respect:—

'Time was, though truth eterne I felt my creed,
That, when men smiled and said, "Thy words are strong,
But others think not thus; and dar'st thou plead
That thou art right, and all beside thee wrong?"
I shrank abashed, nor dared the theme prolong.
Now, in that creed's most high and holy strain
Led to revere the Church's solemn tone,
The calm, clear accents of the chosen One,
Christ's mystic Bride, ordained with Him to reign,
I hear with pitying sigh such taunts profane;
Taught that my faith, in hers, is based secure
On the unshaken Rock, that shall for aye endure.'

The combination of intensely practical religion with a spiritual revival, based on the notion of the continuity of the Catholic Church, is the main object of W. G. Ward's 'Ideal of a Christian Church' (1844), in the preface to which the author says :

'The principles which I have laboured there [i.e. in caps. 2, 5, 6, 7] to establish are such as these: That careful and individual moral discipline is the only possible basis on which Christian faith and practice can be reared; that our Church at present performs the duty with deplorable inadequacy, or rather makes no attempt to perform it,' etc.

In chapter 5 the writer emphasises the absence of moral discipline, the Church's neglect of her duties 'as guardian of morality and as witness to and teacher of orthodoxy,' her 'impotence' 'to perform other duties, especially in protecting and helping the poor,' etc.; and chapter 4 is characteristically devoted to a comparison of the existing ecclesiastical system with that of the early centuries. Without attributing special importance to this book, we may take it as illustrative of the spirit in which the author and his colleagues worked before the unfortunate and unnecessary development which carried some of them over to the Church of Rome.

The general attitude of the school was summed up by Pusey, some years later, in his reply to the question, 'What is Puseyism?'

'Generally speaking' (he says), 'what is so designated may be reduced under the following heads: (1) high thoughts of the two Sacraments; (2) high estimate of Episcopacy as God's ordinance; (3) high estimate of the visible Church as the body wherein we are made members of Christ; (4) regard for ordinances, as directing our devotions and disciplining us; (5) regard for the visible part of devotion, such as the decoration of the House of God, which acts insensibly on the mind; (6) reverence for, and deference to, the ancient Church, of which our own Church is looked upon as the representative to us . . . in a word, reference to the ancient Church instead of to the reformers, as the ultimate expounder of the meaning of our Church.' ('Life,' ii, 140.)

The whole of Pusey's life and work, especially his reliance on the Anglican post-Reformation divines, supplies a sufficient answer to those who would deduce from the

last words of this extract (perhaps unfortunately expressed) the conclusion that Pusey ever wished to undo the Reformation. The context makes it clear that what he had in his mind was the ultra-Protestants who would altogether ignore the Fathers, and that all he meant to assert was that, in case of difference, the Fathers were the more trustworthy guides. The same thought is expressed by the author of Tract 6, on 'The Present Obligation of Primitive Practice,' in the words :

'Is there any one who will deny that the Primitive Church is the best expounder in this matter of our Saviour's will as conveyed through His apostles? Can a learned Church, such as the English, plead ignorance of His will thus ascertained?'

It will be remembered that the late Bishop Creighton claimed for the Church of England, as one of its chief distinctions, that it is a 'learned Church'; and it will not be denied that this learning is, in the truest sense, historical as well as theological.

From this notion of the continuity of the Church springs of necessity the importance attributed to the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession. To the leaders of the Oxford movement it appeared the chief spiritual basis and visible sign of that continuity. Keble, in the preface to his volume of 'Sermons Academical and Occasional,' writes thus (p. xlv.):

'The Anglican theory of Church unity may perhaps be stated sufficiently for our present purpose as follows: That our Lord left His Apostles to be collectively the centre of union to His Church, so that communion with them . . . should be for ever the visible pledge of Church membership; that this communion is secured by the gift of the Apostolical Succession, and of those truths and ordinances of which it is notorious that they were acknowledged as primitive and essential by the undivided Church; that the being of our Lord's kingdom being thus secured, the collective authority of the Apostles' successors is requisite, and is sufficient, to make for its well-being laws of universal obligation; but that this authority, for the sins and divisions of Christendom, having been for many centuries under suspension, and visible unity interrupted, we can but go on, as was said before, each one in obedience to the portion of the Church in which his own lot has been cast, under appeal to the governing body in respect of any debated

points; and so we are preserved, though not in visible, yet, as we may hope, in real mystical union.'

Hence the stress laid upon the doctrine of Apostolical Succession in so many of the 'Tracts for the Times.' The object of the association which led to the issue of the Tracts is thus defined by Keble. 'What think you of a kind of association . . . for the promotion of these two objects—first, the circulation of primitive notions regarding the Apostolical Succession, etc., and secondly, the protection of the Prayer-book against profane innovation?' (Keble to Dyson, 'Memoir,' p. 211). Tract 7 (on 'The Episcopal Church Apostolical'), in discussing the maintenance of spiritual continuity, says: 'Our present bishops are the heirs and representatives of the apostles by successive transmission of the prerogative of being so. Tract 15 (on 'The Apostolical Succession in the English Church') develops the claim to continuity, coupled with a defence of the right to break away from the Church of Rome and reject papal authority without breach of continuity. To quote a later witness, Dr Liddon remarks that 'Keble saw . . . that the Apostolical Succession was the essential bond, recognised by sixteenth and seventeenth century divines, associating the English Church, through the Reformation and papal dominion, with that primitive Catholicism in which Anglicans laid their foundation, and to which they had always appealed' ('Life of Pusey,' i, 271). Now, the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, if it is in its essence a metaphysical or theological doctrine, is also historical; and, when applied to support the continuity of any particular church, requires the aid of historical evidence.

It was with a view, on the one hand, to prove this historical continuity, and, on the other, to bring out the value of primitive teaching and to recall to men's minds the purity of early doctrine, that the Theological Society was established (1835) to promote knowledge and definite views 'by reference to original sources . . . combining study of Christian antiquity with that of the Scriptures'; and that, in the following year, the 'Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, anterior to the Division of the East and West,' was founded by Pusey and his friends, 'in order to recall men's minds to the teaching and principles of the Primitive Church.' It began with Pusey's

translation of the 'Confessions of St Augustine' (1838). As against the notion that the appeal to the authority of the Fathers 'will interfere with the paramount authority of Holy Scripture'; that it involves 'ascribing undue authority to men fallible like ourselves'; or that it 'entails a disparagement of the authority of our own Church, or innovations upon her discipline or doctrine,' the preface to the translation of the 'Confessions' quotes the Canon of 1571:

'Clergy shall be careful never to teach anything from the pulpit, to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and collected out of that same doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops.'

This, remarks Pusey, was an enactment of the Convocation which enforced subscription to the Articles.

'The very language of this Canon itself shows that the rightful authority of the Fathers interferes neither with that of Holy Scripture nor with her own. . . . Our Church being a sound member of the Church Catholic, there is no notion of innovating upon her doctrine or practice, but rather of bringing out more fully how Catholic that doctrine and practice are, to determine in many cases what the meaning of her teaching is, to show things to be Catholic and Primitive, and so Apostolic, which people, because they have only seen them in our Church, think to be human. . . . This, indeed, is the great practical end of the study of the Fathers—not to prove anything, not to satisfy ourselves of anything, but to bring more vividly home to our own thoughts and consciousness the rich treasures of doctrine and devotion which our Church has from their days brought down for us.'

The same thought appears in Tract 38 ('Via Media'):

'I cannot consent, I am sure the Reformers did not wish me, to deprive myself of the Church's dowry, the doctrines which the Apostles spoke in Scripture and impressed upon the early Church. I receive the Church as a messenger from Christ, rich in treasures old and new, rich with the accumulated wealth of ages. . . . Our Articles are one portion of that accumulation.'

Appeals to primitive teaching and the authority of the Fathers are, it need hardly be remarked, constant

throughout the whole series of Tracts; and the duty of making this appeal is especially maintained in Tract 89 and others.

Dr Arnold, in his attack upon the movement, charged its leaders with appealing to the 'antiquarianism of Christianity, not to its profitable history.' This seems to beg the question as to the value of 'antiquarian' research, and as to what was and what was not merely antiquarian in the teaching he condemned; but it is not only to the Early Fathers that the Tractarians made their appeal. One of the first-fruits of the movement was the 'Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology,' designed, according to the prospectus, to consist of 'scarce and valuable works . . . maintaining and inculcating the doctrine and discipline of Anglican branch of the Catholic and Apostolic Church.' In this series were published the works of Andrewes, Beveridge, Bull, Cosin, Hammond, Laud, Pearson, Wilson, and other post-Reformation divines. Tract 71 (on 'The Controversy with the Romanists'), appeals, in defence of the English Church, to the great Anglican teachers, especially those of the seventeenth century, Andrewes, Hammond, Ken and others. Tract 72 refers to Archbishop Ussher, as well as to the Fathers, in defending the Anglican doctrine as to prayers for the dead. To several of the Tracts are appended '*Catenæ Patrum*,' i.e. quotations setting forth 'the testimony of writers in the later English Church' regarding the doctrines of Apostolical Succession, Baptismal Regeneration, the duty of maintaining '*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est*,' the duty of daily morning and evening prayer, etc. The divines appealed to range from Jewel, Bilson, and Hooker (whose works Keble republished in the well-known edition), to Mant and even to later writers. In regard to questions of doctrine, especially to those in which Anglican teaching differs from that of Rome, the greatest reliance is placed on post-Reformation theologians.

'In the seventeenth century' (says the author of Tract 38) 'the theology of the divines of the English Church was substantially the same as ours is; and it experienced the full hostility of the Papacy. It was the true *Via Media*; Rome sought to block up that way as fiercely as the Puritans.'

And he goes on to state his 'irreconcilable differences with Rome.'

The famous Tract 90 itself not only abounds with references to the Fathers, but places equal reliance on the post-Reformation Homilies, which describe 'the usages of the Primitive Church' as 'most pure and uncorrupt,' and appeal to 'the most ancient, learned, and godly doctors of the Church.' Whatever may be thought of the particular arguments, sometimes super-subtle, by which the author of this Tract sought to prove the comprehensive spirit in which he held that the Articles were drawn up, the course of reasoning followed is largely, if not mainly, of an historical nature, and depends on considerations drawn from historical evidence as to the conditions prevailing in the early years of Queen Elizabeth, and the religious and political views of those who compiled the Articles.

The same views and methods of reasoning are displayed in the attachment of the leaders of the movement to the Prayer-book and other formularies of the English Church, and their ardent study of liturgical origins. It is pointed out that the Church of England, in her formularies makes constant reference to 'the custom of the Primitive Church.' Tract 63 (on 'The Antiquity of the existing Liturgies') contains an elaborate study and comparison of the early forms of celebration—Roman, Oriental, Egyptian, Gallican, etc. Tract 67 performs the same task in regard to the rite of baptism. A remarkable outcome of this study was Palmer's '*Origines Liturgicæ*' (1832), of which Liddon says:

'Insisting, as it did, on the almost forgotten fact that the Prayer-book is mainly a translation from earlier office books, and so represents the descent of the Reformed Church of England from the Church of the earlier days, this book powerfully contributed to increase that devotion to the traditions of the Church which characterised the Tracts.'

In conclusion, it should be noted, firstly, that the doctrine of the '*Via Media*,' which emerged from this learned combination of historical and theological study, while based upon the teaching of the Primitive Church, was not identical with it, but was evolved from it, as a plant from the germ, by a logical process of growth,

indicated by Newman in his fruitful and far-reaching theory of 'Development'; and secondly, that it differed, in several essential respects, from the teaching of later Rome at least as widely as it did, in other directions, from that of ultra-Protestantism.

It is hardly necessary to multiply proofs of this latter assertion; but, in view of some latter-day misconceptions, attention may be called to some of the most convincing evidence. In his 'Sermon on November 5th,' Pusey says:

'The principle of the Romish Church was expediency; it was a plotting, scheming, worldly spirit, having at first God's glory for its end, but seeking it by secular means; and, at last, in punishment left to seek its own glory, and to set itself up in the place of God.'

Newman, 'On Romanism,' writes:

'We agree with the Romanist in appealing to Antiquity as our great teacher, but we deny that his doctrines are to be found in Antiquity; . . . and we maintain that his professed tradition is a tradition of men.'

The author of Tract 20 says:

'It is the very enmity which I feel against the Papistical corruptions of the Gospel, which leads me to press upon you a doctrine of Scripture which we are sinfully surrendering and the Church of Rome has faithfully retained. . . . Depend upon it, to insist on the doctrine of the visible Church is not to favour the Papists; it is to do them the most serious injury. It is to deprive them of their only strength.'

In Tract 38 we read:

'Be assured of this—no party will be more opposed to our doctrine, if it ever prospers and makes noise, than the Roman party.'

In 1839, in his 'Letter to the Bishop of Oxford,' Pusey wrote on 'the tendency to Romanism imputed to doctrines held of old, as now, in the English Church.' While discussing various Articles, he showed, for instance, how, in respect of prayers for the dead, the doctrine sanctioned by the English Church, and defended by Anglican divines, excludes the belief in Purgatory as conceived by the Roman Church; how the Roman invocation of saints may be distinguished from Anglican

prayers that their intercession may be heard; how Anglican views on celibacy differ from those of Rome; and so forth.

Nearly a generation later he published (1865) his 'Eirenicon' or (as its full title runs) 'The Church of England a portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a means of restoring visible unity.' Starting with the view of showing how much common ground there is between the Churches, it sets forth the points of difference so distinctly, and defends the Anglican position in so uncompromising a fashion and with such an array of learning, historical and theological, drawn from all ages of the Church, that it might rather be called a 'Polemicon,' and was indeed taken as such by the friends of Rome. The English Church, says the author, holds that there is one Catholic Apostolic Church; that the supremacy of Rome is not primitive; that we, equally with the Roman Church, have 'infallible truth as resting on infallible authority.' In the second part (1869) Pusey discusses, with equal learning and equally firm rejection of Roman doctrine, the worship of the Virgin Mary, in its origin and historical development. In the third part, asking 'Is healthful reunion impossible?' and insisting that for any such reunion the first thing requisite is a clear conception of differences, he proceeds to consider these differences in order, and especially, in a disquisition mainly historical, and occupying nearly half the volume, argues against the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, then on the point of being declared.

If such was the origin, and such the aim and spirit of the Oxford movement, the question naturally arises: How far does modern Ritualism pursue that aim and maintain that spirit? Such a question needs to be asked and answered. It is clear that in many respects, and those the most obtrusive on a superficial view, the 'advanced' clergy of the present day have gone far beyond their predecessors. Pusey, in his later days, deprecated excess in this direction; and it may well be doubted whether the decency and order which appealed to Keble and George Herbert are not in some danger of being lost in extravagance and formalism; whether in some cases reverence is not tending to pass into superstition, and the

life of the spirit to be stifled by materialistic emotionalism. These questions we shall not attempt to discuss; our aim is merely to present some considerations which may be helpful to a solution of the dispute between the Ritualists and their opponents.

During the last sixty years historical study has made great advances; interest in antiquity is more widely spread and better instructed; and the scientific doctrine of evolution has brought the historical view of all subjects capable of historical treatment into greater prominence than before. The result is evident in the tone and method of controversy during recent years. It is hardly necessary to refer to the importance of historical arguments, on both sides, in the Ridsdale and other Ritual cases, in the Lincoln judgment and the Lambeth decisions.

How far the supporters of the Ritualistic movement prove their position is another question; what is here suggested is that the nature of that position, its strength or its weakness, cannot be understood unless full attention is paid to its historical side. It is not so much that new facts bearing on these intricate controversies have been discovered. In the technical sense there may not be much new light; at all events, to discriminate between new and old would be a lengthy and difficult task. It is rather that the attitude of mind of unprejudiced and moderate men has undergone a change. The historian has come to the aid of the lawyer; the purely legal view no longer holds the field; and it has come to be recognised that legal arguments alone, taking no account of historical circumstances and considerations, cannot afford a satisfactory solution.

On the other hand, it would be absurd to suggest that the questions now at issue can be determined on historical grounds alone, even if clear historical conclusions as to doctrine and practice could always be drawn—which is far from being the case. In regard to some practices now incriminated, there can be little doubt that, even on an appeal to history, they would be condemned; in regard to others, no amount of historical argument could defend them in a reformed Church. Again, the appeal to history, the appeal to the Fathers, to the Primitive Church, or the Church of any other period, has its weak side, if any attempt is made to regard it as final. In the

first place, though history tells us, or may tell us, what has been, it does not therefore tell us, necessarily, what ought to be; and too much attention to history is apt to produce a tendency to ignore other important considerations. In the second place, although a rational study of history is the very basis of the notion of evolution, a slavish devotion to the past (it is almost needless to say) must stifle growth and destroy that adaptability which is the condition of continued power. Of all the writings of John Henry Newman, there is probably none of more lasting influence and suggestiveness, none more in consonance with the latest discoveries and the prevalent spirit of science, than that in which he applied the doctrine of Development to the principles of religion. The universal flux, the πάντα ῥεῖ of Heraclitus, applies to the science of theology, and to the doctrine and practice based upon it, as to other subjects which engage the attention of the human intellect, directly or indirectly aided by the divine. Revelation is not once for all, but continuous and eternal. In many ways and through many minds God makes himself known to man. The needs and the intelligence of the present are not the needs and intelligence of the past. To go back to the primitive fount is often well; to lose sight of the source can never be salutary; but to refuse to drink of the wider and deeper stream into which, by the aid of countless rills and by dews from the inexhaustible ocean, it has grown, is wilfully to incur the risk of isolation and decay. The Church, at least that branch of it established in our land, is, we trust, coming to recognise this truth; and only by such recognition will it permanently retain its hold on the mind, as well as on the spirit, of men.

Art. X.—THE LITERATURE OF EGOTISM.

1. *The Garden that I Love; Lamia's Winter Quarters; and other prose works.* By Alfred Austin, Poet Laureate. London: Macmillan, 1894-98, etc.
2. *The House of Quiet: an Autobiography.* Edited by J. T. Murray. *The Thread of Gold.* By the same author. London: Murray, 1904-5.
3. *The Upton Letters.* By T. B. London: Smith, Elder, 1905.
4. *Elizabeth and her German Garden; The Solitary Summer; and other works* by the same author. London: Macmillan, 1901-02.
5. *From December to December: the Daybook of Melisande.* London: Murray, 1905.

EGOTISM is a word which has frequently an opprobrious sense attached to it. This is not the sense in which we propose to use it here. In a certain sense all genuine literature is egotistic. Whatever its subject, it is the expression of the writer's absorbing interest in it. A man who writes about horses because horses are his ruling passion is so far an egotist, though he never mentions himself. Gibbon's History is a monument of this kind of objective egotism. In such cases the writer is lost in his subject. He realises his personality indirectly; he expresses it by indirect means; and it is not for the sake of his personality that others read his work. The literature of egotism which we here have in view is distinguished by the fact that its primary subject is the author himself, or other things in relation to his own idiosyncrasies and experience.

Such literature is, more than any other, apt to lend itself to the service of vanity and diseased sentiment, but it is not necessarily an expression of what is vain, diseased, or foolish. Still less is such a literature of egotism to be set down as valueless or unimportant. The vainest, the most morbid, the most foolish of human beings, could he only give a picture of himself which was really complete and accurate, would be able to produce a work of the highest interest and value; whilst, in proportion as the writer is endowed with exceptional faculties, or with a character so balanced as to render him a type of human

nature generally, the value and interest of his self-revelation are amplified. Indeed much literature which is intensely egotistical in form, is, to all intents and purposes, universal in substance; because the elements which the writer most carefully observes in himself are elements which exist in all men, and to many men in all ages are as important as they were to him. Such is the case, for instance, with the Confessions of St Augustine; and even more noticeably, though in a somewhat narrower way, with the accounts of their spiritual experiences given by the later mystics. St Teresa's accounts of her ecstasies are, in one sense, the quintessence of egotism, in another sense they are psychological documents of permanent value to the students of psychology, and even of medicine.

A similar criticism applies, with the necessary qualifications, to the literary expression of egotism on a less exalted plane. Of such literature the interest and value are twofold. On the one hand it pleases because it is a revelation of idiosyncrasies which stamp the writer as a distinct and peculiar character, thus introducing the reader to an amiable or entertaining acquaintance. On the other hand it pleases or interests, in proportion as the reader finds in it thoughts and characteristics, not distinct from his own, but resembling them, and, by being introduced to the writer, is introduced also to himself.

For both these reasons, and for the latter reason especially, the books now before us are of a kind which deserves attention. They are not only signs of the writers, they are signs of the times also. They are interesting revelations of the manner in which current conditions, social, religious, and intellectual, affect minds which, however exceptionally gifted, represent respectively numbers besides themselves. They belong to that class of literature to which belong Montaigne's *Essays* and Amiel's *Journal*. Montaigne not only charms the reader by exhibiting the individual peculiarities of Montaigne—his views as to the convenience of greatness, or the manner in which he played with his cat; he appeals to him also by the spirit in which he regarded life—a spirit in strong contrast to that of medieval Christendom, and arising largely out of general causes which have not yet spent themselves. Amiel gave to his experiences a universal character by dealing with his own soul as a

specimen of souls in general, when submitted to influences shared by his contemporaries with himself. The books now before us, though perhaps in unequal degrees, appeal to us not only because they represent the writers themselves, but because they also represent various classes of their contemporaries.

Without attempting to draw invidious personal comparisons, we will give to the Poet Laureate the precedence due to his office, and begin by considering the contributions which he, in the intervals between the visits of the Muses, has made to the prose literature of egotism.

Of the five or six specimens of this literature which Mr Austin has given us, we will content ourselves with examining two—'The Garden that I Love' and 'Lamia's Winter Quarters.' The tone and genius which we find displayed in these are similar to the tone and genius which give their character to the others. Mr Austin, in these works, has acquired a reputation more consonant with the defective taste which he imputes to his contemporaries generally than with what is probably his own estimate of the comparative value of his writings. He taxes the readers of to-day with a corporate indifference to poetry; and many of his readers, whose acquaintance with his poetry is imperfect, are diligent in their study and sincere in their appreciation of his prose. This is partly due to the subjects, and partly to the qualities of his style, which bring him nearer in his prose works than in his poetry to the daily interests and comprehension of the ordinary man and woman of to-day. Divesting himself of the laurel proper to the inspired bard, he here meets them as a cultivated and accomplished man, who has indeed an occasional gift for song, but whose interests and manners are not otherwise generically different from their own. He speaks to them familiarly as the lover of his English garden, or the tasteful and scholarly traveller in the highways and byways of Italy. It is true indeed, as we shall see presently, that he manages, with much ingenuity, to enlarge this limited rôle; but such is the character in which he primarily and ostensibly presents himself to his public.

'The Garden that I Love,' though written in the first person, is supposed, by a literary device, not to be written by the author. As the author, however, illustrates it with

photographs of his own home, the disguise thus effected is intentionally of the most transparent kind. The book opens with a very engaging description of a small Kentish manor-house and the charming garden surrounding it. The imaginary writer presents himself to us as the owner and the gardener of this paradise, which he shares with his sister Veronica; and to them, for a visit of indefinite length, come a fascinating young lady called Lamia, and a gentleman who is known by no other appellation than 'The Poet,' the imaginary writer himself being addressed similarly as 'Dear Sage.' The book is occupied with the conversations of this quartette, with a love-affair, ending in an engagement between the Poet and Veronica, and a *tendresse* of the Sage for Lamia, the end of which is indefinite; all this being set in the monologues of the Sage himself.

The reader will perceive that Mr Austin has, for literary purposes, duplicated his own nature, and accorded to the sage and the poet in him two different personalities, so that each may, by contrast or appreciation, bring out the characteristics of the other. In saying this, we are neither surprising nor betraying any personal secret of the writer's; for the Sage, as the photographs show us, occupies Mr Austin's home; and the Poet recites, as his own, passages from Mr Austin's poetry. The device is, as we just now observed, ingenious. We believe it to be also altogether original; and, as related to the end in view, it is very far from being ineffective. At all events, 'The Garden that I Love' is an example of the literature of egotism, which justifies its wide popularity by its signal and peculiar merits. It reveals with vividness and sincerity certain aspects of the Poet Laureate's character with which every healthy and cultivated reader will sympathise; and it does so through the medium of a style which every critical reader will admire. His prose, at its best, may indeed be taken as a model of lucidity restraint, dignity, and appropriate music.

The predominant impression which Mr Austin here leaves with us is that of his country home and his own personal attachment to it; this attachment being amplified into a passionate devotion to the country of which his home is for him at once the product and symbol, and also into a healthy optimism with regard to human life

generally. His many sketches of his small Kentish manor-house, with its rounded gable-ends, its walls smothered in roses, the beautiful garden which was practically his own creation, and the trees and glades of the park lying beyond it, actually place the reader amongst the scenes described, and bring to his nostrils the touch of the Kentish atmosphere. He sees the doorstep littered with drifted rose-petals. He feels the silence broken only by leaves and birds, the warmth of the sunshine, and the falling of the evening dew. The following passage, necessarily somewhat abbreviated, but not otherwise altered, will illustrate some of the qualities of Mr Austin's mellow prose.

'Spring is the most skilful of all gardeners, covering the whole ground with flowers, and shading off the crudest contrasts into perfect harmony; and were it April, May, and June all the year round, I, for one, would never again put spade or seed into the ground. I should select for the site of my home the heart of an English forest, and my cottage should stand half-way up an umbrageous slope that overlooked a wooded vale. . . . One would make just clearance enough to satisfy one's desire for self-assertion against Nature, and then she should be allowed to do the rest. . . . The *Anemone apennina*, now in full bloom in the garden that I love . . . is, as far as my experience goes, rarely seen in English gardens. It used, an indefinite number of years ago, to be sold in big basketsful by dark-eyed, dark-haired, dark-skinned flower-girls in the Via Condotti in Rome, in the months of February and March; and I recollect a good Samaritan putting the finishing touch to my convalescence, after a visitation of Roman fever, by bringing to my room a large posy of this exquisite flower, varying in colour from sky-blue to pure white, and springing out of the daintiest, most feathery foliage imaginable. . . . But with all my partiality for these domesticated wind-flowers, I will not pretend that they can hold a feather to undulating stretches of sylvan anemones; and in April these would be as numerous as the pink-and-white shells of the seashore, which in colour they curiously resemble, around my forest abode. . . . Just as one begins to feel a little sad because the wood-hyacinths pale, the red campion takes a brighter hue and holds up a bolder stalk, determined to see over the heads of the now fast-shooting green crosiers of the bracken; and before these unfurl themselves and get too high, the sleepy foxgloves suddenly re-

member that it is June, and dapple the lush dingles with their spires of freckled bells. All flowers seem to contain a secret; I suppose because they are silent. But the foxglove has always seemed to me to possess more of the mystery of things than any of its sylvan compeers.'

Just as Mr Austin here exhibits himself as a lover of England, so in 'Lamia's Winter Quarters' and elsewhere he uses with equal success the same gift of style in exhibiting himself as the lover of Italy and Italian life. The manner in which his style takes the colour of the things described will be seen by a few extracts from the very charming description which occurs in the opening chapter of the last-named volume. The Sage and the Poet, together with their two ladies, are enjoying a winter in the south, instead of a summer in the north; and from Provence into Italy they travel slowly in a hired carriage.

'I suppose it is' (says the Sage) 'because we are very simple folk, and lead at home a rather primitive life, that we find everything new which most other people find familiar, and so many things attractive that the bulk of the world treat as undeserving of attention. Along that magical coast, where we turned our gaze first to the sea-fringe, then to the hill declivities, then back again to the white-laced bays . . . while we never asked our cheerfully communicative driver to quicken his pace, we frequently begged him to slacken it, and over and over again bade him halt altogether. . . . When luncheon-hour arrived we thereupon came to a standstill. . . . Under a carob-tree, the first Lamia had ever seen, the cloth was spread; and then she scattered rather than arranged her lately gathered flowers, with infinite taste. A short distance away, as we looked under the olive-trees across the ruddy clods and accidental wild-flowers, were the innumerable dimples of the amiable sea. . . . "Is it always like this?" asked Lamia. "Far from it," I was going to reply; but the Poet anticipated me. "Yes, always, Lamia, always, always, always! No one deserves to travel who anticipates anything less agreeable than what he is enjoying at the moment."'

Travelling in the manner thus delightfully indicated, the friends finally settle themselves in a villa not far from Florence. Their quiet life there, with their conversations, expeditions, and impressions, embedded in the narrative and discursive comments of the Sage, form the principal substance of this agreeable and suggestive

volume; and Mr Austin, in dealing with Italy and Italian life, writes with no less charm, and an insight no less delicate, than he does when dealing with the life and the lanes of Kent. Here, indeed, the ripeness of his culture is perhaps even more apparent. Let us present the reader with one quotation more.

‘Refinement is the work of time. You remember Aristotle’s definition of aristocracy—ancient riches. Italy has ancient riches, the riches of law, religion, poetry, and the arts, long established; and she has, therefore, what is most precious in aristocracy. She has ancient speech, and ancient manners . . . and an ancient agriculture. We are sitting at this moment surrounded by a rural cultivation that is described with absolute accuracy in the Georgics, and again by Politian in his Rusticus, written on this very spot, and that has not changed since the days of Cincinnatus. Listen to that fellow singing among the olives. Virgil has described him—“canit fundator ad auras.” . . . It is this far-backness that sheds a glamour over everything in Italy. . . . In proportion as Italy parts with its past, Italy will lose its charm. . . . “Dear Poet,” said Lamia, “will you forgive me if I object that I have sometimes been told, though I am sure most inaccurately, that, for instance, I am charming; and yet I am not ancient.” “Dear Lamia,” he replied, “you are very ancient, and are under deep obligations to ancestors you never saw, and probably never heard of; and I hope you will be yet more charming for your visit to this old and captivating land.”’

On these two foundations or canvases of patriotic and private devotion to his own country, and a devotion more purely æsthetic, scholarly, and critical to a country still older, Mr Austin embroiders innumerable representations of himself, his personal preferences, his philosophic and literary theories, and his attitude towards life generally. Having thus introduced the reader to his method, his style, his manner, we will perform the same office for the writers of the other volumes before us; and then from the manner of each we will go on to the matter.

The curious similarity, in respect of their ostensible subjects, between ‘The Solitary Summer’ of ‘Elizabeth,’ and the ‘Garden that I Love’ of Mr Austin, naturally prompts us to set the two books side by side. ‘Elizabeth’s’ method is simpler than that of the poet. Like him, she presents us with numerous conversations and anecdotes,

but she has not recourse even to the shadow of a consecutive story. For both, however, the primary theme is a garden—a garden in England for the poet, a garden in Germany for 'Elizabeth.' Both, moreover, by a coincidence still more singular, introduce us to their respective domains at the same season, and almost the same day of the year. Mr Austin does so on the last day of April; 'Elizabeth' on the first of May.

To a charming picture of her garden, encompassed by field and forest, she proceeds to add others of her house, her library with its cushioned chairs, and its central pillar masked by surrounding shelves on which are arranged the books which she most delights to read; also of her cook, her gardeners, the peasants of the neighbouring village, and her sole summer visitor, the new Lutheran pastor. She gives us, in short, as Mr Austin does, the whole setting of her country life. Here, however, in one respect, Mr Austin and 'Elizabeth' differ. Mr Austin requires other characters, who are more or less his equals, for the purpose of emphasising his opinions by their questions, their applause, or their contradictions. 'Elizabeth,' apart from her husband, who effaces himself with the most obliging tact, treats all the other characters mentioned by her rather as themes on which to moralise than as persons with whom to converse; and her method is practically one of uninterrupted soliloquy. But soliloquy itself in her hands has an action and vitality of its own. A striking example of these qualities is afforded us by the following passage, the beauty of which must be our apology for abbreviating it as little as possible.

'June 16th.—Yesterday morning I got up at three o'clock and stole through the echoing passages and strange dark rooms, undid with trembling hands the bolts of the door to the verandah, and passed out into a wonderful unknown world. I stood for a few minutes motionless on the steps, almost frightened by the awful purity of nature when all the sin and ugliness is shut up and asleep, and there is nothing but the beauty left. It was quite light, yet a bright moon hung in the cloudless grey-blue sky; the flowers were all awake, saturating the air with scent; and a nightingale sat on a hornbeam quite close to me, in loud raptures at the coming of the sun. There in front of me was the sun-dial, there were the rose-bushes, there was the bunch of pansies

I had dropped the night before, still lying on the path; but how strange and unfamiliar it all looked, and how holy—as though God must be walking there in the cool of the day. I went down the path leading to the stream on the east side of the garden, brushing aside the rockets that were bending across it drowsy with dew . . . and the huge poppies like splashes of blood amongst the greys and blues and faint pearly whites of the innocent new-born day. On the garden side of the stream there is a long row of silver birches, and on the other side a rye-field, reaching across in powdery grey waves to the part of the sky where a solemn glow was already burning. I sat down on the twisted, half-fallen trunk of a birch and waited, my feet in the long grass, and my slippers soaking in dew. . . . Here was the world wide-awake, and yet only for me . . . and nowhere a single hard word being spoken, or a single selfish act being done. . . . There were no clouds, and presently, while I watched, the sun came up quickly out of the rye, a great, bare, red ball; and the grey of the field turned yellow, and long shadows lay upon the grass, and the wet flowers flashed out diamonds. And then as I sat there watching, and intensely happy as I imagined, suddenly the certainty of grief, and suffering, and death dropped like a black curtain between me and the beauty of the morning; and then that other thought, to face which needs all our courage—the realisation of the awful solitariness in which each of us lives and dies.'

Pure meditation of this kind is, as we presently shall have occasion to remark, freely mixed by the authoress with humorous observation of her fellows; but everything else is subordinated to this strain of delicate soliloquy which interprets and gives unity to the whole.

In 'The House of Quiet' and 'The Thread of Gold,' the unifying element is an element of soliloquy also; but in both, and especially in the first, the anonymous author is concerned, even more than Mr Austin is, with the social circumstances of his neighbours and his own personal history. He, too, gives us his meditations in a framework of rural life, introducing us to a home and a neighbourhood which pleasingly take their place beside those which Mr Austin and 'Elizabeth' depict with such complacent zest. The writer, so he confides to us, is a man of position and easy fortune, who, forced by ill-health to abandon his career in some public office, and debarred for the same reason from any other active calling, retires

to a life of enforced but congenial leisure, in his old-fashioned Hampshire home, which he shares with a widowed mother.

'The house' (he writes) 'is a strange medley. One part of it is an Elizabethan building, mullioned, of grey stone. One wing is weather-tiled, and of simple outline. The front, added at some period of prosperity, is Georgian, thickly set with large windows. . . . The meadows fall from the house to the stream; but the greater part of the few acres which we hold is simple woodland, where the copse grows thick and dark, with here and there a stately forest tree. The house, seen as I love best to see it, from the avenue on a winter evening, rises a dark irregular pile, crowned with the cupola and the massive chimneys against a green and liquid sky, in which trembles a single star; and below lies the dim mysterious woodland, with mist rising over the stream, and beyond that, soft upland after upland, out to the horizon's verge. Within all is dark and low. There is a central panelled hall, with round oak arches on either hand, leading through little anterooms to a parlour and dining-room. There are wide meaningless corridors with steps up and down. . . . A large, low, panelled room serves me as bedroom and study together. The windows are hung with faded tapestry curtains. There is a great open fireplace before me, with logs red-crumbling, bedded in grey ash. . . . Odd Dutch tiles pave and wall the cavernous hearth. . . . Here is a tapestried couch; there an oak bookcase crammed with a strange assortment of books. . . . Outside all is unutterably still . . . with the deep tranquillity of the country-side nestling down into itself.'

The life lived by the writer in this home and its neighbourhood, comprising his intercourse with various typical neighbours, forms, in 'The House of Quiet,' the vehicle of his revelations of himself. In 'The Thread of Gold' he is more independent of local circumstance, and betakes himself largely to detached and general reflections; but all these breathe the atmosphere of the same meditative seclusion. The author of 'The Upton Letters,' as the name of the volume indicates, adopts a different literary form, and presents us with a different background. We have only to substitute the word Eton for Upton, and we have before us a well-known Eton master, placed among familiar scenes, performing familiar duties, and revealing

the life which hides itself under these last in a series of reflective letters to an invalid friend in Madeira. Of his general method, no more need be said. Of his style, which is that of a highly cultivated man, we shall by-and-by have occasion to give some specimens; but it hardly calls meanwhile for more particular notice. We will therefore pass on to the most recent of the works before us, which in many ways stands apart, and deserves special attention.

'From December to December,' by 'Melisande,' is in form a continuous mental diary—a diary which concerns itself with thoughts and opinions as experiences, but which, differing herein from all the foregoing volumes, is content to suggest the conditions out of which these experiences have arisen, and abstains from anecdote and description of local landscape. As to her circumstances, all we gather is this, that her home, like 'Elizabeth's,' Mr Austin's, and that of the dweller in the 'House of Quiet,' is in the country, has around it the amenities of wood and garden, and shelters a life of studious and reflective leisure and healthy household activities. This reserve forms a curious contrast to the confidences of the other writers. It results in certain limitations, but it has its own charm and dignity. It may further be mentioned, as a distinction which 'Melisande' shares with the Poet Laureate, that she intersperses her prose reflections with poetry. As she is, we may safely assume, a writer new to the public, we may justify her claims to the attention which we think she merits, by presenting the reader with examples of her powers as a poetess and as a critic.

'From December to December' opens with the following sonnet, one of a series which is admirable for the mastery of form displayed by it:—

'My life is full of sweetness and of peace,
Full of all fair proportion and calm days;
In it all Duty is the dearest ease,
For Duty is the nearest joy always;
And never force or storm or any stress
Can beat upon my walled-in garden-home,
For God Himself walks here to heal and bless
And where He is, not any ill can come.

Within is all may feed the wants of man ;
 There work, and wealth, and intellect are found ;
 And Love is still the deep foundation plan,
 And Love makes all he builds on holy ground.
 If Love within my garden keeps such store,
 Can any Love without offer me more ?

To this illustration of the writer's gift for verse we will add a passage which illustrates her gift for criticism :—

'Chateaubriand's grand emotions of love and religion, even patriotism, did not lead to any growth or variety of intellectual impressions. Chateaubriand of seventy could do nothing better than regret Chateaubriand of seventeen. He seems to have taken on himself from the beginning the "grand air"; and having mounted his stilts, he stalks about on them for the rest of his career. He is determined to keep his head high, and forgets that he is thus preventing himself from taking any fresh observations or learning anything new about life on the natural level. . . . His religion is entirely without personal adventure. It is part of the great rôle he has set himself to play. . . . The peace, the simplicity of Nature were unknown to him. . . . In his allusions to Nature he uses her merely as the theatre of his emotions. He observes little more than what might be described as the "classical events" of a sunrise or sunset, or the bright moon riding in the heavens. Compare, for instance, this scene-painting employment of Nature as a model with the use Blake makes of her. . . . But then Blake was not obliged to think of himself as a peer of France. . . . Yet he (Chateaubriand) had essentially the personality made only for the peace which the world cannot give. He was never happy. How could he be? . . . In the frail, sweet souls of the women he loved he sought very vainly the illusive image of God.'

These quotations will be quite enough to show that in 'From December to December' we have before us a volume which may, without impropriety, take rank with the others as a typical example of the contemporary literature of egotism. Having taken a bird's-eye view of these, we will now consider their significance.

In so far as the interest of such works consists in the exhibition of personal idiosyncrasies—as it does in Pepys' Diary, and the self-revelations of Boswell—the palm must, beyond all doubt, be accorded to the Poet Laureate. Though his egotism reaches far beyond this purely personal circle,

it frankly begins with this, and this is always its nucleus. So genially pleased is he with this particular subject that he not only, as we have observed already, splits himself into two persons—the Sage as entertaining the Poet, and the Poet as observed by the Sage; but he comes to us in another of his volumes under a third aspect also—as the Poet besought by an admirer to observe himself, and bringing out, with modest reluctance, a series of his own confessions. His early attachment to Italy, his reckless moods in youth, his successes with the fair, his exploits among the brave, his lecture to Lord Tennyson on style, the compliments of Prince Bismarck to himself, the philosophic calm of his maturer years, his taste in flowers, forestry, and architecture, his indifference to fame, and his shrinking from personal notoriety, are all put before us with an elaborate and naïve dexterity, which places him high among the practitioners of the purely personal egotism to which the world owes many of its most popular and entertaining works: ‘Elizabeth,’ and the author or authors of ‘The House of Quiet’ and ‘The Upton Letters,’ all make us familiar with their personal tastes and temperaments; but, compared with the Poet Laureate, they are hardly conscious of themselves at all.

To criticise the individual characters revealed to us in these volumes would be irrelevant if it were not impossible. Criticism in this connexion is no more than personal taste, according to which Dr Fell is either liked or disliked; and we will merely observe that the reader, whether his judgment is sympathetic or otherwise, will probably find that the exercise of it is equally agreeable to himself. Criticism proper begins when we leave these questions of individual portraiture and consider how the writers are related to general facts and conditions, not to the private faces which they reflect for us in their own looking-glasses.

Dealing with their works from a purely literary point of view, we shall find much that, in a general way, is interesting. In all these works, though no one of the writers is in any sense an imitator of any other, and though the manner of each is strikingly fresh and individual, we nevertheless encounter certain singular similarities of style. To Mr Austin’s style this observation applies less than it does to the others; but in two

passages which we have already set side by side, the reader will have seen how closely, even in their actual wording, the Poet Laureate's sentences resemble those of 'Elizabeth.' They both speak of what is practically the same day of the year; they both dwell with affection on the same species of flower; and they both complacently assert that in their own respective gardens this species on the same day attains to an unrivalled beauty. A further curious coincidence, indicating a yet deeper likeness, is to be found in the fact that both these writers apply to one of their characters the same fanciful name. Mr Austin, as the host of his other *dramatis personæ*, is, in 'The Garden that I Love,' addressed by Lamia as 'Dear Sage.' 'Dear Sage' is the name which 'Elizabeth' applies to her husband. Between the styles of 'Elizabeth,' 'Melisande,' and the author of 'The House of Quiet,' the general resemblance is still more pervasive and unmistakable. The following passages, for example, which we give consecutively, might be taken by the reader, if it were not for the names attached to them, for passages from the same book. First, a group of personalities:—

'Apart from my professional work, the main preoccupations of my life have been purely literary. . . . Writers have long periods, I suppose, when they don't seem to have anything to say, or even worse, when they have something to say, but can't please themselves as to the manner of saying it. But all these delays, these inarticulate silences, are part, after all, of the same thing.' ('Upton Letters.')

'I am inclined to believe that what makes writing good is not so much the pains taken with a particular piece of work, is not the retouchings, the corrections, the dear delays. Still more fruitful than this labour is the labour spent on work that is never used—that never sees the light. Writing is to me the simplest and best pleasure in the world.' ('Thread of Gold.')

'The gift of expression is something very different indeed from mere garrulousness. Personality, in people who are expressive, bubbles over in thought, word, and deed, every moment of their lives. They are never buried by circumstance; or, if they are, it only results in perpetual resurrections.' ('From December to December.')

Next, a group of country scenes:—

'I came at last by lanes and byways to a silent village that seemed entirely deserted. The men, I suppose, were all

working in the fields; the cottage-doors stood open; near the little common rose an old, high-shouldered church, much overgrown with ivy. The sun lay pleasantly upon its leaded roof and among the grass-grown graves.' ('Upton Letters.')

'There are often wide grassy spaces beside the road, thick-set with furze and forest undergrowth, with here and there a tiny pool, or a little dingle where sandstone has been dug. Down at the base of the hill you find a stream running deep below a rustic white-railed bridge.' ('House of Quiet.')

'There is a dip in the rye-fields about half a mile from my garden-gate, a little round hollow like a dimple, with water and reeds at the bottom, and a few water-loving trees and bushes on the shelving ground around. . . . I can see the reeds glistening greenly in the water, and, when I look up, I can see the rye-fringe brushing the sky.' ('Solitary Summer.')

'The snowdrops shone whitely this morning, like snow in unnaturally hard and good preservation in summer sunshine. An adventurous bee hummed and industriously sucked what one felt must be cold comfort from the snowdrop.' ('From December to December.')

And now to these let us add one passage more, taken literally at random from a work not belonging to the above group:—

'St Martin's summer is still lingering, and the days all begin in mist. I ran for a quarter of an hour round the garden, to get some warmth and suppleness. Nothing could be lovelier than the last rosebuds, or than the delicate gaufred edges of the strawberry-leaves, embroidered with hoar frost, while, above them, Arachne's delicate webs hung swaying in the green branches of the pines.' ('Amiel's Journal.')

The style is the man. Such is the accepted doctrine; and the doctrine is no doubt true. But a comparison of the above passages will teach us something more than this. It will teach us that the style is the man's subject also; and again that, the subject being given, the style is the attitude or position which the man assumes towards it. In the light of these considerations we perceive the kind of general unity which underlies the works now specially before us; and not these only, but others of the same class. The same style is impressed on all the writers, partly because the subject with which they deal is the same general conditions, as immediately affecting themselves; and partly because, as affected by these conditions, they

represent themselves in a passive rather than in an active attitude. They may or they may not be men and women of action otherwise; but, as writers of the books in question, they are men and women of reflection, who watch the course, and accept the results, of the battle, but are not taking active part in it. Here we have the secret of that slowly-moving, gently-cadenced prose common to all of them, and resembling a dilatory stream in which reflected images are abundant because it pours itself over no mill-wheels, and rarely breaks even into ripples.

A general judgment of this kind of course requires qualifications; but in one case only—that, namely, of the Poet Laureate—are these qualifications of any appreciable importance. The author of 'The Upton Letters,' for example, in his capacity of schoolmaster, has at one time led a life full of active duties; and these are now and again discussed; but this volume, as a whole, avowedly represents those elements in him for which such duties provided no expression, and which ultimately prompted him to discontinue them. The author of 'The House of Quiet'—and this is not the only point of resemblance—tells us in so many words that his own position is similar. He, too, once had an active career; but the pressure of circumstances, and probably of temperament also, have made action impossible for him, and have driven him to the unwall'd cloister. 'Elizabeth' and 'Melisande,' in the quiet of their respective woods and gardens, are distinguished also by the same cloistral attitude; and, though her daily duties are for each an important element in her life, each nun, in performing them, becomes as it were her own lay sister, whose activities are contemplated and appraised by a 'moi spectateur' in the background.

Passing from the attitude and manner of these writers to their matter, we shall find that what they are all occupied with, consciously or unconsciously, is the relation of the individual to the religious and moral conditions prevalent in the modern world, and distinguishing it from the conditions prevalent in a comparatively recent past. In this respect the writers are all equally representative. For all of them the conceptions of life and duty that were general a short while ago, and in many quarters are not even yet obsolete, have undergone a change, and require to be reconstituted; and each writer,

in his or in her own way, is here endeavouring to reconstitute them, or expressing an inability to do so.

Thus, 'The Upton Letters,' from its first page to its last, is instinct with Christian sentiment and pungent with Christian phraseology; but when we look for any definite convictions to which this sentiment stands related, we find ourselves merely in a world of slowly dissolving images, which the author once took for realities, but which he takes for realities no longer. He is, for example, moved by some service in an old cathedral; but he has hardly left the building before he goes on to ask, 'What was the power that raised these great places as so essential and vital a part of life?' And he answers his question by saying:

'We have lost it now, whatever it was. Churches like these were then an obvious necessity; kings and princes vied with each other in raising them; and no one questioned their utility. They are now a mere luxury for ecclesiastically-minded persons. Life has flowed away from their portals and left them a beautiful shadow, a venerable monument, a fragrant sentiment.'

Newman's power of belief, as victorious over modern scepticism, is for the author 'but the victory of a certain kind of poetic feeling over all rational enquiry.' Christianity is for him a mere 'faith in God and Love'; and dogma and doctrine merely 'overlay' this 'with definition, with false motive, with sophistry, with pedantry.'

The author of 'The House of Quiet' writes about himself as follows:—

'I am in the position of thousands of other laymen. I am a sincere Christian, and yet I regard the Old and New Testament alike as the work of fallible men, and of poetic minds.'

What his 'sincere Christianity' amounts to may be gathered from another passage:—

'All whose minds are restless, whose imagination is constructive . . . would gladly nestle in the arms of faith, if they could but find her. For these the obstinate question must come. . . . This is the question: Is our life a mere fortuitous and evanescent thing? Is consciousness a mere symptom of matter under certain conditions? . . . Are the old house, the family groups assembled, the light upon the quiet fields at

evening, the red sunset behind the elms—are these all unsubstantial phenomena . . . subjective, transitory, moving as the wayfarer moves? Who can tell us? Some would cast themselves upon the Gospel. But to me it seems that Jesus spoke of these things rarely, dimly, in parables. . . . Enough, some faithful souls may say, upon which to rest the hope of the preservation of human identity. Alas! I must confess with a sigh, it is not enough for me.

'From December to December' exhales precisely the same spirit. The writer, though constantly absorbed in religion as a personal experience, is always emphasising, indirectly if not directly, the conviction that dogma and doctrine are its mere husks and symbols, valuable once, but having no objective truth, and now no longer believable, or—could we believe them—useful. Religion, for the writer, is essentially an adventure of the individual soul, which must freely fashion its creed according to its own requirements. Nor does this tendency to freedom limit itself to mere matters of belief. We find it equally operative in the sphere of conduct also. Thus 'Melisande' attacks the ecclesiastical doctrine of marriage, boldly maintaining that the union which Christ declared to be indissoluble is 'the natural tie of real human affection . . . which God makes between human hearts, and which man cannot put asunder.' Still more plainly does this spirit of personal independence show itself in the pages of 'Elizabeth.'

'Our parson' (she writes) 'is troubled to the depths of his sensitive soul by this custom (i.e. the custom prevalent among the German peasantry of anticipating the privileges of marriage). "Poor things," I said one day, in answer to an outburst of indignation from him, after he had been marrying one of our servants at the eleventh hour, "I am so sorry for them. It is so pitiful that they should always have to be scolded on their wedding-day. . . . They only know and follow nature, and I would from my heart forgive them all." "It is sin," he said shortly. "Then the forgiveness is sure." "Not if they do not seek it." I was silent, for I wished to reply that they would be forgiven in spite of themselves; that probably they were forgiven, whether they sought it or not, and that you cannot limit things divine. But who can argue with a parson?'

'To the common herd' (writes Melisande), 'and in the

popular mind, love without a legal bond is sin. There could not be a greater mistake. Love is always good; but sensuousness, selfishness, or violence of character, or any disproportion, moral or intellectual, between the man and the woman, may easily make love an impossibility.'

These passages do not, and no individual passages could, do justice to the attitude of these writers with regard to spiritual things; for, even when most suggestive of opposition to traditional authority, the opposition is softened by sympathy, and in most cases by reverence. For the author or authors of 'The House of Quiet' and 'The Upton Letters,' for 'Elizabeth,' and still more noticeably for 'Melisande,' even if the old bottles are broken the old wine is still new; and the writers are occupied in devising for it new chalices of their own. With the author of 'The Upton Letters' this is so obviously the case that no criticism is required to point it out. 'Elizabeth' indeed does little more than suggest it to us by a kind of spiritual innuendo; but one passage alone is quite sufficient to betray the moral and religious aspiration which, below the surface, is at work in her. For her, she says, 'a garden is that divine filter that filters all grossness out of us, and leaves us, each time we have been in it, clearer and purer, and more harmless.' The same thought occurs in the pages of 'Melisande,' but amplified and expressed in terms of a much clearer analysis.

'To stand in a quiet place' (she writes), 'surrounded by the trunks of beech-trees and stems of firs; to see everywhere the succulent green leaves of "lords and ladies," the sturdy green of the early spring *spiræa* pushing riotously through the crisp carpet of last year's yellow-red leaves; to hear, harmonised in space, the sweet songs of innumerable birds, is to realise that here—in the fulness of consciousness within—is to be found the Kingdom of Heaven.'

'Melisande,' in fact, of all these four writers, is the one who expresses the spirit of personal religious adventure with most freshness and independence, and with most logical clearness. Thus, the sensitiveness to natural influences described by her in the above passage is by no means, so she tells us, what is meant by an 'enthusiasm for nature' as such. Nature, for her, is an implement by

which the soul is made conscious of its own inward kingdom, and from which it derives its materials for self-expression. Thus, she says, though art in the Middle Ages was wont to copy Nature in many of her minutest details, 'the impulse of that art was neither more nor less than a vivid expression of the religious life of the painters.' 'The essential centre of life,' she continues, 'is within, not from without.' We are first led to 'feel' that such is the case;

'then' (she says) 'some soul touches us. . . . Soon, what had been hidden only in self-consciousness becomes an outward manifestation. Is it Christ alone, then, you might ask, who causes this growth from within? Yes; for though human interests, such as ambition, patriotism, or another, may be startled into activity from a human source, the source of universal life is God alone, and no voice has power to lead us directly to God but the voice of Christ.'

Mr Austin, as we have said already, occupies in these respects a place more or less apart. He, like the others, represents the distinctively modern spirit in having ceased to find help or guidance in the rules or dogmas of tradition, and in seeking to construct for himself a philosophy or adequate life-theory of his own. But even in his capacity of recluse, of gardener, lover of woodlands, shunner of vulgar crowds, sentimental traveller, poet, and aphoristic sage, he exhibits a mundane alertness and a kind of practical optimism wanting in all the others. He feels, for example, as the Upton master does, that the faith which expressed itself in the building of medieval cathedrals can no longer for him fulfil its old functions; but he does not content himself, like the other, with listening to its faint echoes, or wishing that his sense of their beauty could turn them into living sounds again. For him, if the heaven of the Middle Ages is empty, the earth of to-day is full. If we have not a Church to guide, purify, and save us, we have a country to love and serve and ennoble by healthy living. Love still gives to life its old unabated charm; the sanctities of home give it their old dignity; and an orderly simplicity of living, appropriate to each class, is for Mr Austin an ideal which is all the more inspiring because many influences in the modern world are against it. Such are

the typical notes of Mr Austin's creed. It is a creed which he evidently holds with unaffected sincerity; its virility is appropriate to the official position which he occupies; and even those who are least inclined to be satisfied with it can hardly fail to be stimulated by his consistent and courageous exposition of it.

Taking these volumes as representing the various attitudes spontaneously assumed by sensitive contemporary minds towards human life generally, let us now consider what the significance of such attitudes is. The general meaning of life, and the problem of how to live it, may be regarded by the thoughtful mind in various distinctive ways. They may be regarded in the light of a definite and unquestioned creed which is always inviting and demanding fresh individual applications, but neither admits of modification nor requires individual reassertion. They were thus regarded by Dante and the author of 'The Imitation of Christ.' Again, they may be regarded in a spirit of informal scepticism, which, not consciously disavowing a creed nominally prevalent, and not therefore troubling itself with ultimate doubts and difficulties, is content with constructing, as Montaigne did, a practical philosophy of its own. They may be regarded, as Rousseau regarded them, in a spirit of revolutionary idealism, which, turning away from the creeds and the social conditions of the present, derives its vitality from dreams of some vague future; or, as Mill and as Herbert Spencer regarded them, in a spirit which, though equally revolutionary, is not agitated like Rousseau's by imagination and hope, but is austere drilled and disciplined by scientific conviction. Finally, the meaning of life, and the problem of how to live it, may be regarded in a spirit of sentimental regret, which, rejecting the prevalent creed as no longer intellectually tenable, bewails the loss of it as the loss of something that was supremely valuable, and either goes about attempting to save fragments of it, or sighs and weeps at the thought that such attempts are vain. Such was the spirit of Arthur Hugh Clough, who has provided it, in one of his verses, with a very appropriate motto: 'Ah well-a-day, for we are souls bereaved!' *New York*

The contemporary writers with whom we are here concerned suggest comparisons with those that have just

been named. Between the former and most of the latter there are many points of resemblance; but there are amongst those earlier writers two with whose typical and distinctive spirit that of all our contemporaries is in contrast—Dante and Thomas à Kempis. For Dante and for Thomas à Kempis the goal of man's existence was no more doubtful than is the reality and general situation of the unseen land in America for the British emigrant of to-day when he sets out from Liverpool to occupy it. There was no room in their days for intellectual bereavement, for sentimental or scientific revolt, or for any practical philosophy which, in any serious sense, was opposed to, or independent of, the authoritative moralities of the Church. But one or other of these things occupies each of the writers now before us. Each has, in his or her own way, to question much that was then taken for granted, and modifies, restates, or rejects it as a purely personal venture.

In certain other respects, again, some of these writers are almost as remote from Montaigne as from the author of the *'Imitatio Christi.'* They find no room in their minds for even that otiose acquiescence, by which Montaigne was distinguished, in a traditional theory of the universe which sufficed to prevent the awakening of anything like theoretical scepticism, whilst it gave to practical scepticism free play in the affairs of life. There are two of them, however, between whom and Montaigne there are certain points of resemblance. Just as Montaigne acquiesced in the existence of the localised heaven of Catholicism and a visible Church on earth which was the custodian of supernatural knowledge, and yet contrived not to be hampered by this acquiescence when dealing with the affairs of life, so does Mr Austin acquiesce in the loss of both without feeling that the resources of life have suffered much change in consequence. The authoress of *'A Solitary Summer,'* though in a less noticeable degree, exhibits traces of the same practical optimism. She is touched by the malady of the age; but mental health seems never beyond her reach. Though she has lost her belief in 'parsons,' the belief has left no aching void. Her duties to her family and neighbours satisfy her active faculties; and her garden, 'her divine filter,' so elevates and tranquillises her spirit that the life

of duty adds to itself the consolations and exhilarations of religion.

But, if the practical, the informal, the unreasoned optimism of Montaigne thus finds a sort of spiritualised counterpart in the literature of the twentieth century, there are two forms of optimism associated with a much more recent past which are, in the volumes before us, conspicuous by their absence. There are the visionary optimism of Rousseau and the scientific optimism of Mill. There is nothing wonderful in the fact that Rousseau's dreams of the future in store for human society should share the fate of his exploded ideas as to its origin. It is more remarkable that the optimism or the meliorism of Mill, which formed so distinctive a feature of the thought of the nineteenth century, and of which Comte, George Eliot, and Herbert Spencer were among the foremost exponents, should leave hardly any mark on the works of these gifted and sensitive writers of to-day.

If, however, the optimism of the nineteenth century fails to find any expression amongst them, what does find expression in two of them is that century's pessimism. We are not using the word pessimism in the sense of any formal creed. We use it to denote that particular mood or condition in which the mind, having recognised certain external conditions as hostile, admits its inability to combat them, and, as the sole means of saving itself from some mortal wound, withdraws itself in resigned dejection from the spiritual and intellectual fray. Such was the pessimism of Clough. It inspired many of the best-known poems of Arnold. In the nineteenth century it had a large literature of its own; and it breathes to-day, like the sobbing of an autumn wind, through the pages of 'The Upton Letters' and 'The House of Quiet.' In the author or authors of these works it is not due to any personal idiosyncrasy; it is the product of general intellectual conditions. They would, in different circumstances, have doubtless been different men; and it is precisely because their pessimism has this general origin, that their personal manifestations of it possess a general interest. But, though we do not presume to blame them on account of the mood in question, they both express it in a manner which shows with singular clearness that this mood is essentially a malady, and implies a degener-

ation of character. They both succumb to it gracefully, with the gestures of cultivated men; but the grace is the grace of weakness, not of health and strength. They both have talents which might have fitted them for active life; but both, by the same cause, are prompted to retire from action—from constructive mental action, no less than from social.

This retirement, the author of 'The House of Quiet' tells us, was due primarily, in his own case, to physical, not to intellectual causes; but the latter evidently influence him in the same direction as the former. His favourite occupation and pursuit is, he says, literary composition. Now to this his physical disabilities are a help rather than a hindrance; but his literature is the literature of observation, of elegiac regret, of aspirations that are doubtful of themselves; it is not the literature of healthy and whole-hearted exertion. With the author of 'The Upton Letters' the case is just the same. For a considerable portion of his life he had pursued an active calling; and an activity of judgment, especially in literary and educational matters, is abundantly evidenced by the pages of the book. But, when he reveals to us, as in that volume he constantly does, the actual condition of his mind, and the impulses that are most intimately his own, we find him practically paralysed by two conflicting influences, one of which hinders him from assenting to the creed in which he was brought up, and with which he is still in sympathy, whilst the other—namely, the influence of this abandoned creed itself—hinders him from trusting the philosophies in deference to which he has abandoned it. The final result of this situation, both in his case and that of his brother writer—who resembles him so closely as to rouse a suspicion of identity—is a condition of mere emotion, which they both express so charmingly as seemingly to reconcile them to the fact that it is a condition of practical impotence.

In itself this halting between two spiritual worlds, 'one dead, the other powerless to be born,' is not necessarily, let us repeat, a sign of personal weakness. We must, however, confess in honesty that these two particular writers hardly seem to ourselves to have made the best of their situation. The author of 'The House of Quiet' does indeed, as we have seen already, recognise

clearly enough what the difficulty which disturbs him is. It sums itself up, he says, in the great and obstinate question with which modern thought and knowledge are confronting the world anew: 'Is our life a mere fortuitous and evanescent thing? Is consciousness a mere symptom of matter under certain conditions? Who can tell us? Some would cast themselves on the Gospel. Alas, I must confess with a sigh that it is not enough for me.' But there is one thing which this writer makes no attempt to do, and that is to consider the nature of this modern knowledge itself. The Upton master bestirs himself less even than the author of 'The House of Quiet.' He is frightened by science; he is desolated by science; but he accepts these calamities at second or third hand. Of science itself, in the larger meaning of the word, he goes out of his way to boast that he knows nothing. In 'The Upton Letters' he gives us a criticism, most interesting as far as it goes, of the 'Autobiography' of Mr Herbert Spencer; but he accompanies this criticism by the drily complacent admission that of Spencer's interpretation of science he knows absolutely nothing. Now it is perfectly possible for a man to have a very sufficient conception of science in that unified form with which modern thought has invested it, and yet not to have read any one of Mr Herbert Spencer's pages; but, whatever may be the deficiencies of the Spencerian system in detail, Mr Spencer's contribution towards this unifying of science was so enormous that such complete ignorance of his philosophy as the author confesses to is compatible only with a systematic neglect on his part to give any serious and intelligent attention whatever to those intellectual forces the effects of which he is continually bewailing.

The results of the author's conduct in this respect may profitably be compared with that of the Poet Laureate. Mr. Austin probably knows as little of science as the Upton master does; while its principal effects on the tone and temper of the age he manages to misinterpret with the oddest and most grotesque perversity. 'The present age,' he says, 'is practical and pedestrian, caring for astronomy only as an auxiliary to navigation, and for chemistry only as it promotes light, heat, or locomotion.' But Mr Austin, though modern conditions of thought have, in all probability, severed him from the creed of

his childhood even more completely than they have severed the writer of 'The Upton Letters,' has not the same call to submit them to careful criticism; for, unlike that writer, the Poet Laureate has no personal quarrel with them. They may have affected his beliefs, but they do not deprive him of his energies; and having no case against them, he is not concerned to cross-examine them. It may, indeed, be suspected by some that the Poet Laureate's optimism, in the face of intellectual conditions which he so very imperfectly apprehends, is even less intellectually defensible than the other's invertebrate pessimism; but optimism such as Mr Austin's, for those who are able to maintain it, has its own justification in the fact that it is a state of health and vigour. We can hardly quarrel with him for being healthy without taking the proper medicine; but of the Upton master, who constantly complains that he is sick, we have a right to demand that, before he courts our sympathy, he should make all reasonable efforts towards effecting his own cure.

To pursue this question, however, would be to stray beyond our present province. We have been calling attention to Mr Austin and the other writers now before us with a view to exhibiting the ways in which they deal with life, not as sound or unsound, but as representative of the present age. To say that anything like a complete reflection of the religious, intellectual, moral, and artistic tendencies distinctive of the present day can be looked for in the group of works with which we have here been occupied, or even in the class of literature to which those works belong, would be absurd. This literature, which we have called the literature of egotism, though it may often be the work of powerful and active minds, never represents such minds in their more vigorous and active moments; and many of the most important forces now at work in the world lie beyond the reach both of the moods and the literary methods of which works such as these are the result. Still, within their own limits, the books which we have been here examining, especially if compared with similar books belonging to other periods, will, besides charming the reader with their many individual qualities, exhibit to him, reflected in their several tranquil surfaces, many of the forces which are distinctive of our own epoch, and which no literary medium of any

other kind would be capable of presenting to us with equal clearness and delicacy.

The general impression which the reader will derive from this is reassuring. If, in some of these works, or in certain parts of some of them, we come upon signs of a wide-spread mental malady, which, originating with an earlier generation, has not yet spent itself, we find in it various and vigorous activities which may not unreasonably be accepted as symptoms of reviving health. Even the twin authors of 'The Upton Letters' and 'The House of Quiet,' in spite of the partial paralysis which their involuntary scepticism inflicts on them, are in many respects men of the healthiest taste and judgment, and exhibit the happiest mixture of the sensitive appreciation of the artist with the sober and sometimes caustic wisdom of cultivated men of the world. Mr Austin's optimism is exhibited, in these reflective works of his, as affiliated to enthusiasm for his country and its expanding future. 'The Solitary Summer' is evidently the work of one for whom meditative rest is associated with the active duties of the home. In all these volumes we meet with a spirit of high seriousness, enriched and harmonised by liberal and fastidious culture; and in none of them are these qualities more apparent than in that of the authoress who is the latest English contributor to this class of reflective literature, and who thus far is the least known. 'From December to December' represents the mind of a woman of to-day who has been brought up, as she says, under purely secular influences, and surrounded by the claims, duties, and distractions incident to wealth and leisure; but who has found, as a matter of daily experience, that the spiritual life alone can make the life of the world satisfying; and who indicates with singular vividness and a singular charm of style neither due to, nor showing a trace of, any conscious literary artifice, how in her own case the spiritual life and the common life have been united without definite opposition to creeds, and also without dependence on them.

Art. XI.—THE GOVERNMENT OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.
(Cd. 3040.) London, 1906.

AT last the labours of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline have ended; and their fruit, in the shape of a long Report, and four volumes of evidence, is in the hands of the public. The time spent in the work has seemed long to the impatience of some; but we cannot think that any one who reads carefully the well-weighed words of the Report and considers the volume of evidence will charge the Commissioners with undue delay. The matter they had in hand is of vital importance to the Church of England at the present day; and they would indeed have been false to the charge reposed in them if they had hurried their deliberations by a single hour in obedience to ignorant clamour. It is clear that they have left no means untried of discovering the truth; and their judgment comes with the weight of the deliberate utterance of a body of impartial and responsible men.

The Commissioners are worthy of congratulation for having come to the end of a labour that must always have been arduous and often extremely distasteful; but it is matter of even heartier congratulation that their Report is unanimous. The composition of the Commission was representative of the various points of view existing among churchmen; and it might therefore have been feared that the Report, if unanimous, must necessarily be colourless. It is true that no member of the Commission is an extreme partisan on either side; and this fact in itself tended to make unanimity possible. But as it is true that the Commissioners themselves were not a colourless body of men, so it is true that their Report, though unanimous, is far from being colourless. They seem to us to have approached the questions at issue in a fair and comprehensive spirit; they have penetrated beneath the surface, and endeavoured to find the causes of troubles which we all know to exist; and we do not hesitate to say that, whatever the result of their work may be, they deserve the permanent gratitude of all who hope for peace in the Church of England. We

are not in the secrets of the Commission; but, as in every such body, the harmony and success of its deliberations depend mainly on the chairman, we cannot help feeling that a special share of that gratitude must be due to Lord St Aldwyn.

The Report opens with an account of the procedure followed, the sources of the evidence, and the present state of the law. The 'breaches and neglects' of the law are then considered in detail under several heads, the more venial being clearly distinguished from those of a graver kind. This discussion occupies nearly half the volume. After an historical survey of the Ritualistic movement, a very important chapter examines the 'causes of the failure to check irregularities,' and suggests remedies; this leading up to the final conclusions and recommendations.

It is greatly to be hoped that the Report will be read and considered as a whole. If this is not done, the Report, though conceived in a spirit of justice and toleration, will be used as an armoury for partisan arguments. For, to speak briefly, the evidence confirms in large measure some of the charges brought against a certain section of the clergy; but the recommendations go some way towards conceding the principle for which that section has contended. Hence it is clear that the extremists on both sides will be likely to be dissatisfied with the whole, and seek consolation in the different parts. We have great hopes that this will not be the result upon the general body of Englishmen. If it should be, the work of the Commission will virtually have been thrown away.

The Commission was appointed 'to inquire into the alleged prevalence of breaches or neglect of the law relating to the conduct of Divine Service in the Church of England, and to the ornaments and fittings of churches.' The allegations referred to were frequent and persistent. It was asserted that a large body of the clergy, with the consent of the bishops, or, at least, with their lukewarm disapproval, were introducing practices into the English Church which were distinctively and disloyally Roman. The Commissioners give in their Report a succinct account of the circumstances leading to their appointment (pp. 62, 63); and we need say but little about them. The charges came from one section of

churchmen mainly; and, though it was largely asserted that they were exaggerated, yet the fact that they were persistently made caused great distress and confusion. It seemed clear that, if nothing were done, legislation would be forced upon the Church without full deliberation and reflection; and there can be no doubt that the Government of the day did wisely in recommending the appointment of a commission of enquiry. The charges, as we have said, were mainly directed against 'Romanising practices'; but there was a feeling in many minds, less vehement and strident in expression, but very strong, that irregularities of another kind were prevalent and required consideration. The Commissioners have wisely addressed themselves to the investigation of irregularities of all kinds. After receiving vast quantities of evidence from various quarters, they conclude as follows (p. 52):

'The law relating to the conduct of Divine Service and the ornaments of churches is, in our belief, nowhere exactly observed; and certain minor breaches of it are very generally prevalent.'

This, as it stands, seems a sufficiently startling conclusion, though we believe it to be absolutely true; and the question at once arises, of what nature are the irregularities, and is any classification of them possible?

The Commissioners have given us a classification of the irregularities. They first of all explain their view of the legal standard to be applied, and then catalogue the breaches of which they have evidence, distinguishing those which have no significance from those which imply a serious departure from the rule of the Church of England, and again from those which are insignificant in themselves, but derive constructive significance from their connexion, or some other circumstance. The standard applied by them is, roughly speaking, the wording of the Acts of Uniformity as interpreted by the King's Courts. This, of course, raises the thorny question of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Commissioners tell us that they thought it right to receive and to test evidence proffered to them as to the position of the Judicial Committee and its judgments. But they did not think it a part of their functions, as not being 'a judicial

body, to express opinions by way of criticism of, or agreement with, the judgments of the Privy Council.' They notice that these judgments 'are open to reconsideration by the Court itself'—a point on which popular opinion has, we think, held a different view; and they take the judgments as 'the latest judicial interpretation of the rubrics' (p. 10).

It is important to remember the standard applied in considering the list of irregularities. The Courts have virtually assumed that the Prayer-book and the Acts of Parliament connected with it give a complete and sufficient rule for the conduct of Divine Service. Hence a large number of practices appear as technical breaches of the law which are unimportant in themselves, and the inevitable result of the changing outward circumstances of the Church. We need say little of the numerous small breaches of law which belong to this class. They include such practices as the omission of the exhortation, 'Dearly beloved in the Lord,' in the Communion service; the introduction by the bishop of an address in the Confirmation service; and the making of a collection during morning and evening prayer. Some, though perhaps not to be classed as significant, are more important and serious than these, e.g. the saying of the words of administration to a row of communicants instead of to each individual; omitting the second part of the words altogether; omitting daily service, or all services for Ascension Day; omitting the ante-communion service at a celebration.

It is certain that different persons would attach different weight to these irregularities. It is commonly argued, for instance, that omissions such as some of these go far to justify the very wide departures from the letter of the law on the side of excess. But, apart from the fact that an argument like this will only bear rhetorical use, we think that the Commissioners are generally justified in their classification. The omissions above-named are in no sense the rallying-points of a party. No one would dream of going to prison rather than say daily service, though we have heard the omission defended on grounds which gravely imperil Church order. The ante-communion service is omitted by those who have evening communions, and in parts, frequently

in large parts, by those who follow Roman rubrical directions. Moreover, it would appear that the more important of these breaches are diminishing under the direction of the bishops. Though it might seem, therefore, that the Commissioners have failed to appreciate the full significance of some of the breaches of law classed under this head, we think that this would imply a superficial judgment of their work. We hope that the more serious of these breaches will be corrected with all speed, especially the failure to keep Ascension Day; but we cannot think that the correction of them will cause serious or lasting difficulty. They imply a deficient appreciation of the ideal of the English Church, but they do not necessarily imply its rejection or the substitution of another; they might all be rectified without any general disturbance of the whole ecclesiastical position.

We come, then, to consider the breaches of the law which, in the opinion of the Commissioners, have significance. It is here that the severest strain must have been put upon the temper and fairness of the Commission. It has been the practice of the accusing party to label an immense variety of practices as Roman, or of Romeward tendency. In regard to some of these this charge has long since been seen to be absurd; e.g. the wearing of the surplice in the pulpit. Hence it is possible to argue that, as some practices, denounced fifty years ago as Romanising, have been almost universally adopted without untoward results, it may be expected that the same thing will happen in other cases; and that practices which appear Roman to many to-day will find their place in a few years in the regular course of English Church-life without causing offence to any one. The Commissioners might have chosen one of two courses, both of which they have avoided. They might have taken the average opinion of to-day as to what is and is not 'Romanising,' and in the light of it given a rough judgment of praise or blame upon the various practices brought before them; or they might have accepted the principle of ritual innovation mentioned above, and refrained from condemning everything but avowed Roman propagandism. In either case they would probably have pleased one of the extreme parties in the Church. By accepting the average opinion as to what is Romanising, they would have pleased the

accusing party; because, even if their final list of Romanising practices differed from that of the Church Association and Mr Bowen, the principle would have been conceded that the decision lies with average lay opinion. On the other hand, if the right of ritual innovation had been conceded, the extremists on the other side would have been encouraged, even if they had had to surrender for the present some things they like.

In the line they have taken, which is far the most difficult line, the Commissioners have certainly not courted popularity. They have, in effect, endeavoured to determine what is Roman in tendency, and why. They have asserted with emphatic decision, against those who seem to claim an almost unbridled liberty of innovation, the necessity of discipline and regularity and law in the services of the Church; and they have removed their decisions, we hope, from the very possibility of the charge of partiality by putting them upon an intelligible basis of principle. As we have said, we doubt whether they have courted popularity by so doing; and we do not doubt that their decisions on these points will be sharply criticised. But we venture to urge that all criticisms will be irrelevant which do not face the principles laid down. One person may wish that a given practice had been condemned more emphatically, others that the lines had been drawn less strictly; but all such states of mind fall short of the actual position of the Commissioners. Their judgment on this side or that has been governed by a principle; and the only question which can really concern them is whether their principle is wrong or right.

The test which they apply to ritual practices is simple enough in appearance. A ritual practice which has significance, it is assumed, is one that embodies or signifies a doctrine of some sort. It becomes necessary, therefore, in regard to any given practice, to enquire what doctrine it signifies. The Commissioners recognise here three classes of ritual practices:

- (1) those 'which either are not significant of doctrine at all, or may reasonably be regarded as significant of doctrine formally defined and adopted by the Church of England';
- (2) those 'which may reasonably be regarded as significant of teaching legally declared not to be contrary or repugnant

to the articles or formularies of the Church of England'; (3) those 'which are significant of doctrine or teaching contrary or repugnant to the articles or formularies of the Church of England' (p. 15).

The passage which follows (pp. 15, 16), and which indicates the effect of this classification, is of such importance that we transcribe it here in full.

'Deviations [from the legal standard] comprised in the first class are altogether free from objection on the ground of their significance, though in some cases they may offend against the Church of England's condemnation of excess and obscurity of ceremonial. Deviations comprised in the second class cannot be said to have of necessity a harmful significance. But, as they represent doctrines which Churchmen are neither required to hold nor forbidden to contradict, they can claim no sanction under the rule hitherto laid down, both by episcopal and judicial authority, that such forms of worship as are prescribed for general use should embody those beliefs only which are assumed to be generally held by members of the Church. The principle underlying this rule ought, in our opinion, to be maintained. Experience has, however, shown that a rigid enforcement of uniformity is apt to hinder the healthy progress of religious life under such conditions as those of our day; and there will probably be cases in which some practices significant of teaching legally declared not to be contrary or repugnant to the articles or formularies of the Church of England may reasonably be allowed. But in no circumstances would this, in our opinion, be right, except under conditions of efficient regulation, and with careful regard for the opinions and feelings of congregations.

It is obvious that irregularities in the third of these classes are far more serious than those comprised in the other two. The only question that can properly arise as to them is not whether they can be sanctioned, but how they can most effectively be dealt with so as to be made to cease.

Matters of doctrine are not included in the reference to the Commission, and therefore we will not attempt to define the precise limits of each of these three classes. Nevertheless we think it right to state that the question, whether a practice falls under the third category or not, indicates a principle of paramount importance which ought to govern all action with regard to ritual irregularity. It is hardly necessary to say that there are other considerations which must also be taken into account before a decision can be

reached as to what ought to be done in any particular case. For example, a series of many practices, each of which would separately come in the first or second class, may, in combination, produce a result open to very grave objection.'

After this statement of principle the Commissioners proceed to deal with a number of breaches of the strict law which have been reported to them. These are dealt with under thirty-six heads, to which are added three chapters on Confession, Prayers for the Dead, and Manuals (i.e. books offering instruction in ritual and in devotion). Among these practices they distinguish rightly for special condemnation the following (p. 75):

'(1) The interpolation of the prayers and ceremonies belonging to the Canon of the Mass; (2) the use of the words "Behold the Lamb of God," accompanied by the exhibition of a consecrated wafer or bread; (3) reservation of the Sacrament under conditions which lead to its adoration; (4) Mass of the Præ-sanctified; (5) Corpus Christi processions with the Sacrament; (6) Benediction with the Sacrament; (7) celebration of the Holy Eucharist with the intent that there shall be no communicant except the celebrant; (8) hymns, prayers, and devotions involving invocation of, or confession to, the Blessed Virgin Mary or the saints; (9) the observance of the festivals of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the Sacred Heart; (10) the veneration of images and roods.'

Of these, (1) is said to obtain 'in some churches where extreme ritual is practised'; (2) occurs in fifty-two churches out of the 559 about which evidence was given; (3) in thirteen churches or possibly more; (4) in three or four instances; (5) 'in five services and nineteen notices of services'; * (6) in one instance; (7) in 114 services where there was no communicant besides the celebrant (but not necessarily with intent that there should be none); (8) in four churches hymns addressed to the Blessed Virgin were used, but there is 'no evidence of actual invocation of the saints in the services of any church'; (9) there were in evidence two services and two notices of services on the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary; one service on the feast of the Sacred Heart; (10) there were reported thirty-one churches in which there are images with lights or flowers in front of them; and in sixty-seven roods exist,

* These services did not include processions.

but 'no devotions to the rood, such as are prescribed in the Sarum Missal for the [two Black-letter] anniversaries [connected with the Holy Cross], were reported in the evidence.' All these practices—and it may be noted that in many cases they appear to be extremely rare—are condemned without qualification. It is difficult to conceive on what principle they can be defended, except on the ground mentioned but not discussed by the Commissioners (p. 15), that they form 'part of the heritage of the whole Catholic Church.' To this point we propose to return.

Of the other practices mentioned in this section of the Report, some—for instance the use of vestments—are widely prevalent. The Commissioners have had before them reports concerning 559 churches, in 491 of which vestments are in use. But this total seems to fall far short of the number of places where they are used. The 'Tourist's Church Guide'—a work which has been laid before the Commission—states that in 1901 vestments were in use in 1526 churches out of the 14,242 in England and Wales. In dealing with these and similar irregularities the Commissioners draw a sharp distinction between practices which are clearly and historically connected with the definition of the doctrine of Transubstantiation and those which are not. They are apparently willing to accept the disclaimer of those who deny all connexion between the vestments and Roman doctrine, but they say that in a large number of the services of Holy Communion described to them the combination of

'vestments, the Confiteor, illegal lights, incense, the Lavabo, the ceremonial mixing of the chalice, a posture rendering the manual acts invisible, the sacring bell, and the Last Gospel' tends to 'change the outward character of the service from that of the traditional service of the Reformed English Church to that of the traditional service of the Church of Rome' (p. 53).

In the same paragraph they remark that

'it may well be doubted how far elaborate spectacular ceremonial of this kind can be consistent with the spirit and genius of the Church of England.' And they then add: 'In our opinion, such observances as the blessing and use of holy water, Tenebræ, the washing of altars, and the benediction and lighting of the Paschal candle, may emphatically be said to belong to the class of ceremonies which were designedly abandoned in the sixteenth century.'

If, then, we ask what condition of the Church of England the Report reveals, the answer would appear to be somewhat as follows. There are a certain number of practices, not 'accurately' to be 'described as prevalent,' which 'lie on the Romeward side of a line of deep cleavage between the Church of England and that of Rome.' There are others, more widely prevalent, which, by implication only, or in combination, can be said to involve Roman doctrine; some also which transgress the line of reserve which the Church of England has adopted. In other places there are omissions which, when taken together, set up 'a standard of worship and of religious observance . . . differing widely from that which the Prayer-book enjoins.' This is highly unsatisfactory; it implies in various directions a looseness of hold upon the principles of the English Church which cannot be good for it as a society; but it does not appear to us to be a condition of things which should lead to panic or hasty action of any kind. There was sufficient cause to justify serious and dispassionate enquiry; there is every reason for considering carefully the account given in the Report of the causes of this legal confusion, and, we hope, for making a serious effort to give legislative effect to the recommendations of the Commissioners. To these we now pass.

The latter part of the Report, which contains the legislative proposals of the Commission, is their answer to the second of the questions put before them in their reference, viz. 'to consider the existing powers and procedure applicable to such irregularities, and to make such recommendations as may be deemed requisite for dealing with the aforesaid matters.' They begin by giving a summary account of the rise of Ritualism, and of its development in the direction of illegality. We need not dwell upon this. They then pass to the consideration of the causes which have produced the present condition of things. The causes are twofold. In the first place the law itself is inelastic and imperfectly adapted to the Church-life of the present day.

'It needlessly condemns much which a great section of Church people, including many of her most devoted members, value; and modern thought and feeling are characterised by a care for ceremonial, a sense of dignity in worship, and an apprecia-

tion of the continuity of the Church, which were not similarly felt at the time when the law took its present shape' (p. 75).

In the second place, the constitution of the Court of Final Appeal has been 'another strongly operative cause of the failure to secure obedience to the law' (p. 64). The Commissioners appear to regard the objections to this Court as well-founded. 'It is recognised,' they say (in consequence of the 'clearer perception of the functions' of a Court 'exercising the royal supremacy in ecclesiastical causes' due to recent historical investigations), 'that the authority exercised by this Court is that of the Crown and not that of the Church' (p. 65). The result has been that the authority of the inferior Courts, which are governed by the decisions of the Final Court, has been weakened; and bishops have been disinclined to appeal to Courts the jurisdiction of which would probably be denied by their clergy, and have tended to deal with irregularities by private monition rather than by appeal to the law. These private efforts have been, in the opinion of the Commissioners, largely unsuccessful; and, though they attribute this in some measure to lack of firmness on the part of the bishops, they trace it mainly to the imperfect condition of the law.

'Occasions have arisen,' we read (p. 75), 'more often than has been realised by the Bishops, when the interests of the Church and her due administration demanded that discipline should be enforced by action in the Ecclesiastical Courts.'

But the real remedy is, in their opinion, a reform of the law.

The reforms recommended are extremely comprehensive. They include the abolition of the Episcopal Veto on prosecutions, though a power would be reserved to the Court to stay frivolous or vexatious proceedings. The changes to be made in the rubric should be determined, in the first instance, by the Convocations, acting under Letters of Business, and in consultation with the Houses of Laymen. The constitution of the Courts should be modified in accordance with the recommendations of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission in 1883, except that the Final Court should be bound to ask and follow the opinion of the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces on any question 'touching the doctrine or use of the Church of England,

which question is not in the opinion of the Court governed by the plain language of documents having the force of Acts of Parliament' (p. 77). Apart from this, the 'Crown Court should decide all questions of fact in contest between the parties, including the proper construction of words and documents (if any) which are the subject-matter of the complaint' (p. 66). Bishops should have extended powers, as a body, for the regulation of special services, etc.; and in their own dioceses they should be empowered to refuse institution to presentees who fail to satisfy them of willingness to obey the law, and also to take action in their own Consistory Courts. The number of dioceses should be increased in order that supervision may be made more effective; and this increase should be made the subject of a general Act of Parliament. Wilful disobedience on the part of incumbents should lead to deprivation, with disqualification for further ecclesiastical office until they should have satisfied the Archbishop of the Province of their readiness to obey in future.

It will be seen from this summary account of the recommendations of the Commission that the changes they contemplate are neither few nor slight; moreover, the Commissioners definitely say that they regard them as mutually dependent, clearly looking forward to their acceptance or rejection as a whole. We most sincerely hope that this unanimous and weighty Report will not share the fate of the Report of 1883. Its unanimity may be a protection to it, and, we hope, also the manifest desire which is obvious in it to deal fairly and boldly with the situation. As we have already said, we hope that both parts of it will be considered, and in connexion. The Commissioners have confirmed the belief that breaches of order occur in considerable numbers in the Church; on the other hand, they find that

'the evidence gives no justification for any doubt that in the large majority of parishes the work of the Church is being quietly and diligently performed by clergy who are entirely loyal to the principles of the English Reformation as expressed in the book of Common Prayer' (p. 76).

It should be impossible for the present state of recrimination and controversy to go on in face of conclusions like these. But it is easy to find points in the Report, especi-

ally in its second part, which will arouse criticism. Many will be alarmed at any prospect of alteration in the rubrics; already some persons have addressed memorials to the Commission deprecating any change in the legal position of vestments, or of the requirement to use the *Quicumque vult*. Others may feel that the opinion of the majority of the Archbishops and Bishops might be of a somewhat one-sided character, as would have been the case in the days when Lord Shaftesbury exercised a paramount influence in their appointment. Others again may feel that the recommendation that the Crown Court should interpret documents having the force of Acts of Parliament will give rise to difficulties; the interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric, for instance, by the majority of the Judicial Committee being a case which has not commanded universal assent. We ourselves are inclined to wonder whether the Bishops whose compromises are condemned had really any course open to them other than that which they took, at a time when there was no hope of any legislative amelioration of the conditions. But all these points, however interesting and important in themselves, are of infinitesimal importance compared with the great issue which is really raised by the Report, whether the Church of England in its present form is to go on at all.

The situation described in the Report is one of gravity, not so much because of the practices of omission or commission detailed in it, as because of the principles involved in them. From the first, the Church of England has included two principles or ideals which may easily be pressed into antagonism; the importance and the danger of the present situation is that they *are* being pressed into antagonism. The Commissioners found it no part of their duty to discuss or balance the conflicting elements in the Church; they have dealt with the external phenomena, which are the symptom of the inward conflict; and their Report is, in effect, an exhortation to both parties to make sacrifices of predilections and prejudices in the interest of peace. The party of ritual innovation are exhorted to look reasonably at the points in controversy and to remember the generally reserved character of Church of England worship; and they are assured of consideration in the legal changes contemplated. Their opponents are also exhorted to equity and reasonableness

of judgment, and are assured of the maintenance of the true principles of the Reformation. If the precept, and still more the example, of the Commissioners is followed, we think the publication of this Report will give hope of a most encouraging kind for the future of the Church of England. No one can say that the last years of its history have shown it in a satisfactory light; but a general acceptance of the Report as a basis for future action will, we hope, make a fundamental change in this respect.

If this is so, it appears to us that to ignore or to shelve this Report will be to lose a great opportunity. Such a course will leave the conflicting elements in the Church to develop into sharp antagonism; and there will be every reason to fear that an actual disruption may be the result. The Commissioners have found, as a fact, that irregularities occur; and that the main hope for peaceful correction of them is to be found in the adaptation of archaic legal machinery to present requirements. It will surely be impossible in practice, now that this finding is before the world, to try to correct the irregularities and yet leave the machinery unreformed. On the other hand, we do not doubt that, unless the irregularities are corrected, and the rule of law restored in the Church, revolutionary changes must inevitably ensue.

We have said that the Commissioners found it no part of their business to discuss and to balance the conflicting elements in the Church of England. But it cannot be denied that their Report will be subjected to criticism by various parties in the Church in the light of the principles for which they stand. We propose therefore, in conclusion, to consider very briefly the relation of these principles to the present situation.

The circumstances of the Reformation brought into prominence one great religious principle which the later Middle Ages had obscured: we mean, of course, the right of individual access to God through faith in Christ. This principle was obscured rather than denied in the unreformed Church, for it has its place in all the books which were then counted authoritative; but it was obscured so effectively by the vast and complicated system of intermediaries as to be inoperative in the minds of most Christians. To have restored it to its

proper place in Christian thought was an inestimable advantage; and, even if we think that the processes of change might have been better ordered, with less complexity of motive, and less party spirit and passion, it remains that we owe the restoration of this supreme truth of Christianity to the Reformation, and especially perhaps to Martin Luther. But, though vital to the truth of Christianity, it does not exhaust the Christianity of the New Testament. In the New Testament it stands side by side with the idea of a society, and of man conceived as a social being for the purposes of religious relations to God.

As soon as this is said it becomes clear that a problem of adjustment has arisen, which must necessarily be difficult to solve. It is obvious that, if we lay exclusive stress on individual access to God, and on individual conviction, we shall think somewhat lightly of all the externalities which are involved in the existence of a society—the ministry specially set apart for the performance of religious functions, the sacramental rites, the fixed order of common worship. These may be retained by a conservative people for reasons ranging from mere expediency and conservatism to a sense of a secondary religious value in them; but they will not be regarded as possessing even a relative necessity. Further, it may easily appear to those who take this extreme view, that all things of an external sort which have ever been misused so as to come between the soul and God must be for ever condemned and surrendered. Here we shall have a principle of revolution rather than of reformation; and the idea of a continuous history of the Catholic Church will be lost. Instead of making changes with the least possible disturbance, people who hold this view will tend to lay emphasis on differences and demand freedom from the past without reserve or qualification. And once more, the loss of the desire for continuity with the past will have a further effect: it will put the whole question of Church order in a new light. The notion of a faith, once delivered, in any sense controlling the free right of the individual to interpret Scripture for himself, will tend to disappear; and in place of it we shall have either a variety of loosely organised societies, or a single society treated simply as a department of the State; for, if there is no inherent

necessity for any Church order, the State, composed of a body of persons possessing *ex hypothesi* equal right to interpret Scripture, may fix religious as well as social order.

These expansions of, or inferences from, the true principle which the Reformation emphasised are not imaginary. They have all taken shape in positive policy; and they are, some of them, with us still. To our mind they are both disastrous in themselves and inconsistent with the true spirit of the Church of England. They are disastrous in themselves, because they represent a one-sided interpretation of a principle true in itself, and have the fate of all one-sided interpretations; they end in a contradiction of the position from which they started. It is strange that a doctrine which started by vindicating the rights of the individual, the reality of his spiritual movements, and the necessary union of religion and life, should end by driving religion back into the recesses of the individual conscience, and leaving large tracts of life untouched by it. Yet this is so. We find extreme individualists in religion, like Harnack, criticising Luther for his inadequate view of the consequences of his position, and retaining, therefore, elements of visible order ('Wesen des Christenthums,' cap. xvi.); or like Martineau finding the true form of Christianity in 'lonely pieties' incommunicable to others; and it is past denial that one of the causes of the Tractarian movement was the limited character of the prevalent form of evangelical religion. It is a bad thing for men's religion to be too withdrawn and private; it tends to make them readily satisfied with themselves, their opinions, their conclusions, and their achievements; and the temptation to persecute always lies near at hand. The self-reliant believer in his own paramount religious capacity becomes intolerant when he finds people arriving at different conclusions.

This frame of mind has always existed within the Church of England, and exists now. There is a considerable number of English churchmen who are not only hostile to the Church of Rome, but suspicious of everything that has ever been associated with it; and it is in these circles that we find the most vehement defenders of the principle of Establishment as such. The findings of the Commission have brought most pro-

minently forward the question of the Romish significance of the legal irregularities complained of. The Commissioners feel bound to express their regret at the language employed by some of the witnesses; and a cursory consideration of the evidence certainly leads us to share this regret. The witnesses in question use a vocabulary of their own, of which 'question-begging epithets' form a large part; and they seem to see nothing strange in accusing others, on the ground of their own interpretation of certain practices, of holding doctrines repudiated by them. Doubtless, this method characterised the polemic of the Puritans in earlier centuries of the Church's history, but it has never been the method of the Church of England. We are grateful to the Commissioners for having so clearly and reasonably indicated the lines of distinction between practices which have Romish significance and those which have not. We earnestly hope that their boldness will be justified in the event, but we cannot help seeing that in this part of their work they are in conflict with a governing principle of many minds. A large number of those, however, who belong to that wing of the Church are far from being extreme; and we have every hope that the advantage of unity, and of the possession of a working principle for deciding ritual questions, will enable them to give their weight towards the carrying out of the recommendations.

We have spoken, perhaps somewhat frankly, of what we may call the accusing party in this debate. We have said we do not accept their principle in isolation; indeed, we do not think it in accordance either with Scripture or the mind of the Church of England. It certainly has its place in the Church of England; the mistake lies in forcing it into antagonism with everything else. We must now say a few words on the other side of the question—the side which those of whom we have been speaking appear to us to ignore.

From the time of the Reformation to the present day there have been persons who, while in general sympathy with the desire for reform, wished that it should be carried out with as little disturbance as possible to outward unity and continuity. They have a strong sense of the Church as a society governed by rule; and they are uncomfortable, not to speak more strongly, in

the presence of outward disunion. They see that the Church is more than a national expression of religious ideas; they cling to the term Catholic; and they claim for the Church a right of determining its own internal questions, quite independently, it may be, of the majority of opinion in any given State. They have no necessary and essential dislike of Church Establishment; but they differ from the opposite party in sitting very loosely to it. If one party would sacrifice much to retain the principle of Establishment, the other is apt to be suspicious if required to sacrifice anything at all. The question of the relation of the State to the Church hardly figured at all in the complaints brought before the Commission, and was not included in the terms of reference. But the line of defence taken by some who supported the action of the party of ritual revival brings up this question immediately. At this point, again, we think the Report will have to run the gauntlet of adverse criticism, and we propose therefore to consider briefly what the Commissioners have actually said that bears on the matter, and how far the probable criticisms upon them from this side are well-grounded.

The Commissioners start with things as they are; that is, they consider the Church in England as a body which is *de facto* under Acts of Uniformity, and in which the powers of the Crown, whatever they may be, are exercised by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It is difficult to see what else they could have done. They were not bidden to consider fundamentally the relations between Church and State; they were bidden to consider and report on the condition of the Church as it is. However wrongly, in point of theory, the Acts of Uniformity and the Privy Council are related to a spiritual body, there can be no doubt whatever that, in point of fact, they are in existence. Then, in their Report the Commissioners have recognised the possibility that not all ritual practices complained of are Roman in significance; they have called attention to the breakdown of the present system of Courts; they have proposed another in which the definitely spiritual character of the Church should have fuller recognition, and reserve their sternest condemnation for practices whose illegality does not depend upon judgments of the Privy Council (p. 75). So

far as the question of Church and State is concerned, it is difficult to see what more they could have done. The constitutional way of amending defects in the existing arrangements is by acts of Convocation and Parliament; and this is the method which the Commissioners propose for the defects which they recognise. We do not think that the most sensitive advocate of the spirituality of the Church can quarrel with them so far, except on grounds which would make Establishment impossible.

A more serious question arises over the position and rights of a national Church; and for this question it is irrelevant whether the Church is established or not. What powers has a national or local Church in the definition of its own doctrine and practice? The question is a complicated and difficult one; and we only propose to consider it here so far as it affects the Report before us. In two places (pp. 15 and 54) the Commissioners refer to persons who defend acts manifestly illegal according to the English standard, as 'part of the Catholic heritage,' or as part of 'Catholic custom' to which they feel themselves bound to submit. There is no discussion of this position in the Report; it is tacitly set aside; but it is maintained by some, as is obvious from the evidence; and we may well ask how far it is involved in the principle of continuity which, as we have said, is held tenaciously by a certain number of churchmen. Perhaps we may venture to say, to begin with, that, so far as we are aware, it is a new point; or rather it is an old question in a new form. It has arisen, in our opinion, as a necessary result of the claim of the present English Church to be continuous with the Church before the Reformation; in fact, it is a form of the difficult question of development. If we were contented to say that our Church is the creation of the sixteenth century, no such question would arise; we should only have to explain, if we could, our connexion with the Apostles and with Christ. If, on the other hand, we claim to go back through the centuries to our Lord Himself, and, at the same time, to adopt some things and reject others in the intervening period, it is obvious that we must settle on what principle this is to be done.

It does not appear to us that those who claim that the local Church is bound by Catholic custom are at all clear in their minds as to what this means. A very careful

examination, for instance, of Lord Halifax by various members of the Commission totally failed to elicit any clear statement as to the form or nature of the appeal to Catholic custom. This uncertainty is, we think, partly due to the newness of the point; those who have raised it in its present form have hardly yet had time to define their views and test them in application to various cases. And, still more, it appears to us that the question has been conceived so far in too close a relation to actual subjects of present dispute. Lord Halifax admitted (Q. 23,260) that the Church of England was justified in ordering Communion in both kinds—a regulation which, so far as we know, has never been seriously contested within the English Church itself; but he denied (Q. 23,218) that it has any right to forbid reservation for the sick—a matter in hot debate at the present moment. We do not understand on what basis he admits the one and condemns the other. We should say, and we think it probable that he would agree, that the Roman Church was acting *ultra vires* in limiting Communion to one kind in face of the Institution. And we should say, and he would certainly agree, that no Church has a right to exclude sick people from Communion because they cannot come to church, for this would certainly be a transgression of the Lord's command. But we do not see why a Church should be precluded from ordering that the Communion of the sick should take place in one way and not another. So long as reservation is only for the sick—and we understand that this is Lord Halifax's claim—it is a question of method and expediency, and no more. We doubt whether the Church can be said to have settled finally questions of this sort, which are essentially questions of local circumstance and convenience.

We think it will be found much harder than is expected to define the nature of 'Catholic custom,' and the degree of its authority over national Churches. It is in a position very different from that of doctrine. In the latter we have Scripture before us, to which all ages of the Church necessarily make appeal, and which exercises a regulative influence over all doctrinal discussions. It is comparatively easy, for instance, to show that the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin and the immaculate conception of our Lord stand, to say the

least, on totally different footings in relation to the teaching of the apostles. But there is nothing answering in character or authority to Holy Scripture for our guidance in questions of mere practice; in discussing Catholic custom we are in the same sort of position as we should occupy in the discussion of Catholic doctrine if all the books of the New Testament had been lost. It cannot but be that this must make a vital difference to the whole question. The Commissioners have not entered upon the subject in their Report, though they have clearly had much evidence laid before them in regard to it. We do not think that their recommendations necessarily raise the question; they propose to refer certain matters to the decision of the Church as a spiritual body; and for these a national Church would be admitted, probably by all, to be competent. We sincerely hope therefore that no difficulty from this quarter will impede the carrying out of the recommendations as they stand.

So far, the prospects of the Report would appear hopeful. It was anticipated with great and anxious foreboding by many, and there was good reason for the feeling. The Commission was appointed at a time when controversy was exceptionally acute; and it has been difficult to conceive that the Commissioners could travel so far as they have from the tone of the period of their appointment. They have worked hard, and looked fairly at things; and they offer the Church and nation a great opportunity. If the chance be lost, we shall, as we have already said, be worse off than ever; but, if the Church is allowed to set to work in the spirit of the Archbishop's appeal to Convocation, and if the other recommendations of the Commission are carried out without unnecessary delay, we have good ground for hoping that the danger of disruption, which is always present to a body constituted like the English Church, may be indefinitely postponed.

Art. XII.—THE GENERAL ELECTION IN FRANCE.

1. *The Church in France.* By J. E. C. Bodley. London: Constable, 1906.
2. *La Séparation des Églises et de l'État.* By Aristide Briand. Paris: Cornély, 1905.
3. *À propos de la Séparation des Églises et de l'État.* By Paul Sabatier. Second edition. Paris: Fischbacher, 1906.
4. *L'Année Politique.* By André Daniel. Paris: Perrin, 1904, 1905.

THERE is no truer maxim in French politics than the oft-quoted saying, 'It is always the unexpected that happens.' This absence of political stability makes prophecy or deduction absolutely impossible. When, in the nineteenth century, the future of a French dynasty seemed most assured, its downfall was imminent. Charles X had laid the foundations of the French African empire by the capture of Algiers, and the internal peace of France seemed assured by the birth of the Comte de Chambord, when a street-row was transformed by journalists into a Revolution which drove the elder branch of the Bourbons from the throne. Louis Philippe had to all appearances beaten his opponents, and M. Guizot had become Prime Minister in name as well as in fact, when the prohibition of a banquet roused the fury of the Paris mob and forced the King of the French to fly to England. The policy of the Third Napoleon had been fully ratified by a *plébiscite* when the rashness of M. Ollivier's Ministry plunged France into a disastrous war, which culminated in the overthrow of the Second Empire. In the same way a Parliament, in which, out of 590 deputies, only 129 were pledged to the separation of Church and State, has repealed the Concordat of 1801. Again, when the forecasts of political meteorologists, based on the unpopularity of the 'affaire des fiches' and of the inventories of Church property, foretold disaster to the Government, and even the confidential reports from the constituencies led the Minister of the Interior to anticipate the loss of some thirty seats, the Government has secured the largest solid majority yet given to any Administration since the foundation of the Third Republic. The question is, what relation this majority bears to that

conflict which has raged between Church and State during the last two years.

To understand the history of the Concordat, we must begin with that all-night sitting of the National Assembly on August 4, 1789, when the representatives of the clergy surrendered their privileges and their tithes to the nation. On November 4 all ecclesiastical property was also placed at its disposal for the support of public worship, the maintenance of the clergy, and the relief of the poor. On February 13, 1790, monastic vows were suppressed; and on April 13 the Catholic religion ceased to be the religion of the State. On July 12 the Civil Constitution of the clergy was passed, and the Pope disestablished in France. This Constitution was never accepted by the Holy See. In 1794 the Convention decreed the separation of Church and State, thus depriving the schismatic Church of all its revenues and privileges. There was some revival of religion after the suppression of the Reign of Terror; and many emigrant priests who refused to accept the Civil Constitution of the clergy began to return to France. This respite was, however, but short-lived, for, when the reactionary movement had been defeated by the Directory, the clergy was again subjected to persecution and the Church placed under disabilities. France was in a state of religious chaos; and the people were clamouring for the man who would not only restore the old forms of Christian worship but regularise the situation of the State in its relations to the Church.

Every circumstance was therefore favourable to the adoption of the Concordat signed at Paris on July 15, 1801. Its main object is set out in the preamble:—

‘The Government of the Republic recognises the Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion as the religion of the vast majority of French citizens. His Holiness also acknowledges at the same time that this same religion has derived, and hopes for, the greatest benefit from the Establishment of Catholic worship in France, and especially from its profession by the Consuls of the Republic.’

Its chief provisions were as follows. The Catholic religion shall be freely and publicly practised in France. The First Consul is to nominate the bishops, and the Pope to confer canonical institution. The bishops and clergy

shall take an oath of obedience to the Government. Bishops are to appoint parish priests, subject to the Government's approval. The Holy See pledges itself not to disturb those who purchased Church property at the time of the Revolution. The Government guarantees a proper salary to bishops and parochial clergy, whilst full power of founding endowments is conceded to French Catholics.

The Concordat was supplemented by the 'Organic Articles,' the work of Portalis, the eminent jurist, which professed to define the points that had not been settled by the Concordat. These Articles provide that no bull, brief, rescript, decree, mandate, provision, or other document emanating from the Vatican may be published in France without the consent of the Government; no synod or other national or diocesan ecclesiastical assembly may be held without its express leave; no bishop may quit his diocese without permission from the head of the State. The professors in the seminaries must subscribe to the Gallican Declaration made by the French clergy in 1682, and undertake to teach its doctrines. The salary of archbishops is fixed at 600*l.*, of bishops at 400*l.*, of the first-class parochial clergy at 60*l.*, and of the second-class parochial clergy at 40*l.* a year.

Though these Articles were never cordially accepted by the Holy See, they have remained untouched as the complement of the Concordat even under the Restoration; but they are now abrogated at the same time as the original document. M. Sabatier regards separation as a natural evolution, though the abolition of the Concordat was not, as has been already said, part of the Ministerial programme at the general election of 1902. Whilst 129 deputies advocated separation, 140 absolutely declared against it; and the great majority regarded the question as so absolutely outside the region of practical politics that they did not even mention it in their election addresses. This was, however, no reason for leaving the Church at peace.

There was dissension and disagreement in the ranks of the Republican 'Bloc.' Radicals and Socialists, who had remained united in their campaign against the Congregations, began to drift apart. At Saint-Étienne all the eloquence of M. Roannet was insufficient to keep the revolutionary Socialists in order; and they showed them-

selves in a majority of three to one. M. Jaurès endeavoured to distract attention by asking the Chamber, after the outbreak of the Eastern war, to give up the Franco-Russian alliance. This attempt at reunion proved a conspicuous failure. The Radical Left decided to uphold the alliance, and were supported by the 'Union Démocratique.' This incident nearly broke up the Ministry; and there were rumours of dissensions between its more conservative and its more advanced members. The Government was placed in a minority more than once; and it was evident that an attack upon the Church alone could rally all sections in its support. The Government had therefore, in self-defence, to introduce a Bill for the suppression of Congregational teaching.

Under the old regime, and during the early part of the nineteenth century, elementary education had almost entirely fallen into the hands of the religious orders; and a certain number of these were specially authorised by the Government to teach in elementary schools. The Christian Brothers, the Brothers of Saint Viateur, the Marists, and others, had founded schools on every side. M. Combes therefore asked the Chamber to declare that in five years' time all Congregationist teaching should come to an end, and that the property of the authorised Congregations should be liquidated in the same way as that of those which had not been authorised by law. This measure was carried with a few amendments, of which the most important extended the period from five to ten years, while another permitted teaching Congregations to support novitiates in France for the supply of teachers to French schools abroad, in the colonies, and in countries under the French Protectorate. These modifications were not extensive enough to affect the union of the Ministerialists; and the Socialists rallied once more to the Government, on the plea that they would otherwise split up the majority and arrest the anti-clerical work of the Cabinet.

Fresh evidence had, however, to be given of its hostility to religion; and the Easter recess was devoted to the removal of all crosses, crucifixes, and other religious emblems from the courts of justice. This measure gave rise to protests on all sides, especially when Good Friday was chosen to carry the order into effect. The Order of

Advocates even talked of a public demonstration, to be headed by their president, but nothing was done; and the courts reopened without any of those disturbances that had been anticipated. These were, however, but passing skirmishes and led no one to expect the great fight on the separation of Church and State, which was the indirect result of President Loubet's visit to Rome.

French Catholics had done what they could to prevent this visit, which they regarded as a solemn ratification by a Catholic power of the spoliation of the Papal States by Victor Emmanuel; and an attempt was even made to refuse the necessary credits, which was defeated by an overwhelming majority in the Chamber. The Pope protested against M. Loubet's action; but his protest was not published until it appeared in M. Jaurès' paper 'l'Humanité.' This protest recalled the fact that the heads of Catholic states were bound in a manner totally different from the heads of non-Catholic states; that they were united as such by special bonds to the Supreme Pastor of the Church, and must therefore extend to him the greatest consideration in so far as regards his dignity, his independence, and his imprescriptible rights; that this duty, hitherto acknowledged by all, was specially binding upon France, which, through a bilateral agreement, enjoyed signal privileges, such as a large representation in the College of Cardinals, and possessed, by special favour, the protectorate of Catholic interests in the East; and that, in paying a formal visit to the King of Italy at Rome, on the spot that once belonged to the pontifical See, M. Loubet had seriously offended the Sovereign Pontiff. If, notwithstanding these facts, the Nuncio still remained in Paris, this must only proceed from grave motives of order of the most special character.

This protest was resented by the French Government. On May 21, 1904, M. Nisard, the French Minister to the Vatican, was recalled; and on the 27th an order of the day was adopted by the Chamber, approving of the rupture of political relations between France and the Vatican. This was the first step towards the separation of Church and State. The rupture was, however, by no means complete. M. de Courcelles remained in Rome as *chargé d'affaires*; and Monseigneur Lorenzelli, the papal Nuncio, was allowed to remain in Paris. Graver complications

were, however, at hand. Monseigneur Geay, the Bishop of Laval, had been for some time out of touch with the Catholics of his diocese, one of the most religious in the whole of France. He had, as a rule, distinguished himself by his enthusiastic support of the Government, and by his advanced political views. In this capacity he had been fortunate enough to earn the approval of a certain section of the press. On the other hand, the local Catholic newspapers were bitterly hostile to him. He had been accused of conduct which, if not positively proved to be immoral, was certainly most indiscreet; and his authority in his own diocese was absolutely nil. Then Monseigneur Le Nordez, the Bishop of Dijon, was also at loggerheads with his clergy; he had shown such want of dignity and propriety that seminarists in his own diocese had in many cases refused to accept ordination from him. These two bishops were however, notwithstanding their local unpopularity, special favourites with the authorities, as being animated with the most favourable sentiments towards the Government of the Republic.

On May 17, Cardinal Vanutelli wrote to the Bishop of Laval to remind him that the Holy Office had, in the name of the Holy See, already asked him to give up of his own accord the charge and direction of his diocese, and informed him that, as the very grave reasons which had inspired the Holy See with this resolution still prevailed in their integrity, he was himself compelled formally to renew this invitation. He therefore ordered him to take the necessary steps so that the Holy Office need not be compelled to adopt further measures, which would certainly be taken if, in a month's time, he had not obeyed this order. This letter was forwarded by the bishop to the Minister of Public Worship; and the French Government protested that by its action the Holy See was infringing the fifth section of the Concordat, which provided that nominations to vacant bishoprics should be made by the First Consul, and only canonical institution conferred by the Holy See. The Government argued that these provisions ought to apply also to dismissal and enforced resignation; and that a bishop's powers could neither be conferred nor withdrawn without the approval of the Republic.

On June 3 the Government again complained of the

action of the Nuncio in writing to Monseigneur Le Nordez ordering him to suspend his ordinations. They argued that the Nuncio, as a simple ambassador, had no right to correspond with the bishops; and that this also was a violation of the Concordat, as the Papacy could in no way diminish the prerogatives of a bishop or partially depose him without the approval of the Government. This was followed by protests against the action of the Papacy in summoning Monseigneur Geay and Monseigneur Le Nordez to Rome. The Cardinal, in his reply, maintained that the bishops were dependent upon the Supreme Pontiff in the exercise of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and that they were obliged to visit Rome once in every four years. He also pointed out that these facts had already been mentioned verbally by the Nuncio to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and had appeared to him satisfactory.

These explanations were of no avail; and the Government instructed M. de Courcelles to close all relations with the Holy See, intimating at the same time that they considered the mission of the papal Nuncio to the Republic as also at an end. M. de Courcelles left Rome, and the Nuncio Paris, on July 30, thus terminating to all practical purposes that Concordat which had governed the relations of France with the Holy See for over a century. The whole cause of all this controversy was shortly settled, so far as the bishops themselves were concerned. Monseigneur Le Nordez and Monseigneur Geay both left for Rome to make their submission. They were found guilty of disobeying the orders of the Minister of Public Worship, who had forbidden them to leave their dioceses; and their salaries were suspended. This was a great blow to the Government, which had hoped to found a national Gallican Church with the help of these two bishops; and nothing now stood in the way of the Bill which was to give parliamentary sanction to the abrogation of the Concordat with Rome by the disestablishment and disendowment of the Catholic Church in France. Although M. Combes had pledged himself, on October 21, to introduce the measure, he was in his turn assailed by a fresh agitation, which eventually drove him and his Government from office. The 'Figaro' of October 27 and 28 started this new movement by disclosing to the world the whole

system of espionage which had been organised in the French army by General André, the Minister of War, and some of his political supporters.

It appeared that, at the beginning of 1903, some Freemasons had decided, under the pretext of Republican defence, to organise within the army a secret service of inspection and information. This secret service set immediately to work; and, within a few months, a regular intelligence department was established, with hundreds of amateur detectives ready to keep the Minister of War in constant touch with the religious views and political opinions of their brother officers, on the tacit understanding that they would be rewarded by promotion over their victims' heads. The whole of this secret service had its spies, its bloodhounds, and its inspectors, who well knew they might expect crosses, stripes, and even special appointments, in return for good work done. The author of this organisation was Commandant Pasquier, the Governor of the Cherche-Midi prison; and his notion was taken up by the 'Grand Orient' of France, a body which has long been severed from all connexion with British Freemasonry. Under the title of Sol. Mil. ('Solidarité Militaire') they resolved to found a new association amongst those officers who were Freemasons. Brethren were invited to secure information themselves, and in their turn to pass it on to the 'Grand Orient.' Who were the father, the mother, the relations, and the belongings of their brother officers, and of their brother officers' wives? Where had they been educated—in a religious or in a lay school? What were their clubs, and what society did they frequent? What were their religious opinions, and where did they send their children to school? With whom did they shoot and hunt, and at what châteaux did they stop? The whole series of questions ended with: 'Is he an anti-Semite?' The issue of this police circular was bitterly opposed by a section of the order before it was printed and circulated; indeed some brethren denounced it as dishonourable to Freemasonry; but they were overborne by the majority. Several local lodges declined to have anything to say to this policy; but the fact remains that some twelve thousand *fiches* or slips of paper were filled up. We can only give one specimen as characteristic of the rest.

'Fiche No. 22. Commandant Bonnan (I.L.C) at Bruyères will be recommended by General Bonnal for promotion. He is a fanatical clerical; started, on his arrival at Bruyères, by going solemnly to Communion with his whole family. Owing to the example he has given, officers and non-commissioned officers have begun to frequent church assiduously. When the local municipality had a dispute with the parish priest, who wished the children educated in the secular, to attend catechism in the free schools, he took the side of the parish priest. His wife hears catechism at the sisters'.—Note O.'

This slip also contained the names of four other officers, three of whom were condemned with the same fatal O, the fourth, however, being recommended. Commandant Bonnan had been licensed by the Staff College, and passed extremely high through the military school; but his chances of promotion were destroyed by this fatal mark, while his juniors have been made lieutenant-colonels over his head. Jacquot the 'informer' was, on the other hand, promoted out of his turn, and became the youngest lieutenant-colonel in the French army.

On October 28, 1904, Col. Rousset, Nationalist Republican Deputy for the Meuse, raised the question in the Chamber. He was followed by M. Guyot de Villeneuve, who produced the correspondence between Captain Mollin, aide-de-camp to General André, and M. Vadecard, the secretary to the 'Grand Orient' of France. The General attempted to stem the torrent of indignation which had been roused by these disclosures by disputing the authenticity of the documents produced. He even proceeded himself to burn those which had accumulated at his office; but he set fire to the chimney and thus made his complicity clear to the world. M. Vadecard made things worse by prosecuting his assistant, M. Bidegain, for having stolen the documents to sell them to M. Guyot de Villeneuve and his friends. The subject was again brought up; and General André, who had in the meantime thrown his aide-de-camp, Captain Mollin, to the wolves, argued that the practice was necessary in the interests of the Republic; whilst M. Berteaux, the reporter on the War Budget, went still farther and maintained that the system was a legacy from the days of clerical and reactionary domination at the War Office. It was useless to argue; and the Chamber threw out the order of the day by a majority of only two

votes. Some sort of reaction was however produced by the conduct of M. Syveton, a Nationalist deputy, who gave General André, who was an old man, so violent a blow in the face as to throw him to the ground. The mischief had however been done; and General André was forced to resign office. He has now revenged himself by telling the whole story to the press.

In the meanwhile M. Guyot de Villeneuve continued to prosecute his campaign with vigour, and every day published, either in the 'Figaro' or in the 'Gaulois,' a series of 'slips' relating to suspected officers, with the names of those who had informed against them. The Legion of Honour took the matter up; and General Février, formerly High Chancellor, agreed to receive all petitions from its knights and other members asking the Council to proceed against those members who had furnished secret and malicious information. The feeling grew stronger every day; and, when the Chamber met, the order of the day, which was taken as a vote of confidence, was only carried by a majority of six. As this included six members of the Cabinet who had no seats in the Chamber, while M. Doumer, the President (who sided with the Opposition), could not vote, the result was virtually a defeat; and M. Combes had to resign. On Jan. 27, 1905, M. Rouvier's Government appeared before the Chambers and read a Ministerial declaration, which included a Bill for the separation of Church and State, which proved in some respects more indulgent to the Church than its predecessors, and was laid upon the table of the Chamber of Deputies on February 9.

Mr Bodley, in his interesting but somewhat sketchy essay on the 'Church in France,' which is but a prelude to a more comprehensive work, explains the position of M. Aristide Briand, now a Cabinet Minister, but then *rapporteur* of the Bill. A measure, even when introduced by a Government, is submitted to a small committee of each House, which reports upon it and, if necessary, redrafts it.

'Consequently a Government Bill, when discussed in each Chamber, is only secondarily in the hands of a Minister, but is in charge of the President and the Reporter of the Commission. The latter is a most important personage. It is his function to write an essay on the subject of the Bill, called a report, which, in the case of an important measure,

attains colossal proportions. Thus, during the passage of the Separation Bill through Parliament, the Minister of Public Worship played only a minor part, while the Prime Minister of France took practically no part at all, actually never opening his lips during the long debate in the Senate of which he is a member.'

M. Aristide Briand's voluminous report is mainly occupied with the quarrels between the kings of France and the Papacy. He then reviews the history of the Concordat, and of the relations between France and the Papacy since its signature, discusses the position of the Church in other countries, and concludes with an exposition of the Bill itself, and of the principles underlying each separate clause. This statute, which became law last December, and applies to the Protestant and Jewish Churches as well as to the Catholic Church, begins with the declaration that the Government guarantees liberty of conscience and of public worship, subject to the provisions of the Act, whilst it in no way recognises nor subsidises any form of religion. All state, departmental, and communal subventions for public worship are to cease on January 1, 1906, except in the case of chaplains in schools, colleges, hospitals, prisons, and other public institutions.

Then follows the famous third clause, which provides for taking an inventory of all ecclesiastical property—the clause which has led to such commotion throughout France. Within a year from the passing of the Act all movable and immovable property of the 'menses' and 'fabriques' must be transferred to the 'Associations Cultuelles,' or associations for public worship. That property which in the past belonged to the State, the departments, or the communes, is to be given back to its original owners, with the exception of those pious endowments which have been created subsequent to the Concordat. Ministers of religion who are sixty years of age, and have been for thirty years in the pay of the State, are to receive a life-pension of three-quarters of their salary, whilst those who are forty-five years old, and have been salaried by the State for twenty years, receive a life pension of 60*l.* a year. This affects, to some extent, some of those highly-paid Protestant pastors who have hitherto received 120*l.* a year; but it is particularly hard on the

archbishops and bishops of the Catholic Church, whose salaries have amounted to 600*l.* and 400*l.* a year. Those ministers of religion who are not qualified for these pensions are to receive subsidies on a much smaller scale.

The cathedrals, churches, and chapels are left gratuitously at the disposal of the associations to be formed under the Act; but episcopal palaces, presbyteries, and seminaries are only granted rent-free for two years, when all these buildings will revert to the State, the department, and the commune. Further arrangements may, it is true, be made then; but this must depend on the goodwill of Governments and of local authorities. The 'Associations Cultuelles' are to consist of residents in the parish; and their membership ranges from seven to fifteen or twenty-five, according to population. They may raise funds by subscriptions, collections, and fees, and may distribute whatever surplus they possess to poorer associations. Their accounts are to be audited; but the amounts of their accumulated funds are strictly limited by a scale proportionate to their revenues. Beyond these there are other provisions of a general character. Religious instruction may be given, out of school hours, to children between the ages of six and thirteen. Libellous or provocative utterances in churches are punishable by fine and imprisonment. The budget of public worship, which in 1905 amounted to 1,700,000*l.* a year, will, after the expiration of life-pensions, be divided among the communes of France for the alleviation of taxation.

Such are, roughly speaking, the provisions of this new measure, which, nominally at least, gives full liberty to the Catholic Church in France, and emancipates the Jewish and Protestant communities from all connexion with the State. As Mr Bodley observes, with some truth:

'For the first time since the French people became a nation, the Pope is the absolute master of the bishops and clergy of France. Gallicanism, long declining, has received its death-blow; and Pius X himself sang its solemn obsequies on Quinquagesima Sunday, when, in his basilica of Saint Peter at Rome, he consecrated the first batch of fourteen non-concordatory bishops, forming one-sixth of the entire French episcopate, being, it is said, the largest number admitted at one time to the pastoral office since the Day of Pentecost, when it was conferred on twelve overseers of an unestablished Church.'

These words, notwithstanding their possible exaggeration, indicate a great gain to the Catholic Church in France; for, whatever may happen in the future, the Government can no longer legally object to the appointment of able and independent men as archbishops and bishops of the French Church, and can no longer advance the claims of those in whom they expect to find willing and subservient tools. The intrigues of ambitious men, ready to sacrifice their religious and political principles to secure the support of the Government, will, at least for the present, be of no avail. Rome need not negotiate any more over vacancies, or consent to the nomination of inefficient men in one or two instances so as to secure the consent of the Government to a good appointment in the third instance. The bishops are allowed free intercourse with Rome, and may go thither as often as they like. They may meet to discuss matters regarding the welfare of the Church, and even choose the subject of discussion without any interference on the part of the State. They will no longer be government officials salaried by the State, and may so far succeed in their appeals to the faithful on religious grounds.

Taken by themselves, these are great and substantial advantages. The question is, how long will the Church be left to enjoy them in peace? The Radicals and Radical-Socialists are in their hearts a *bourgeois* party, who dread a progressive income-tax and look askance at the programme of the Socialists. In their anxiety to divert attention from these dangers they may at any moment recommence their attacks upon the Church, and, by insisting that the Government shall exercise some control over the nomination of bishops and others, rob the Church of all the liberty she has acquired under the new law. Then, again, others argue that either the priest will not be free, or the State will not be master. The clergy may also, now that they are free, throw themselves into politics. This will not be wise on their part; but they may argue that, having ceased to be government officials, they have acquired all the rights of free citizens. As we have pointed out, libellous or provocative utterances in churches are punishable by fine or imprisonment. This provision may be abused and extended.

Past experience also makes one sceptical with regard

to the future. Recent years have witnessed a marked evolution in the administration of the Associations Law. M. Waldeck-Rousseau undertook that it should not be applied to teaching or authorised orders, and that authorisation should be granted to unauthorised orders if they made out a good case. These pledges were broken by M. Combes both in the letter and in the spirit. Therefore French Catholics ask anxiously with regard to the future—how soon the liberty they have gained will degenerate into persecution; how soon the State will again insist on having a voice in the nomination of bishops, of vicars-general, and even of parish priests; to what extent the auditing of the accounts of the 'Associations Cultuelles' will be carried; how long they will be allowed to enjoy the free use of their churches; and how much of their property acquired since the Concordat, and even since the passing of this Act, they will be allowed to hold free from all state interference.

This is, however, not their only grievance. The new law, even if fairly administered, contains a great element of hardship. The budget of public worship, which amounted to 1,700,000*l.* last year, was not an act of grace but a measure of compensation. Before the outbreak of the French Revolution the tithe alone brought in 3,200,000*l.*, or nearly double the income secured to the Church under the Concordat. Beyond this there was the annual income of the Church and the revenues secured by endowments, the product of legacies and gifts made by pious founders, which were appropriated by the State or sold by public auction. The budget of public worship was the result of a clear and definite bargain between Church and State. The purchasers of Church property were to be freed from all interference and guaranteed security in their possessions; but the State was to give the Church some measure of compensation, and this compensation was to be the budget of public worship.

This contract has been ruthlessly broken by the State; and, except for a few terminable pensions, the clergy will be absolutely dependent upon the faithful. This may be no great hardship in the large towns, or in those rural districts where there are rich and charitable landed proprietors, or where the people are religious and the churches full to overflowing. But such cases are the exception

and not the rule. Indifference and apathy in religious matters are now frequently to be found in the French peasant, who, however, often has a friendly regard for his parish priest, though he may not frequent his church except on great occasions. Even in these cases the lot of the disestablished and disendowed priest will not be so hard, as he is sure to get some compensation from his neighbours for what he has lost; but there are many parishes, especially in the centre and in the south of France, where the priest's salary from the State represents almost all his income, where baptisms and even religious marriages and burials are the exception, and where the churches are empty on Sundays and holidays of obligation. The position of these incumbents will be pitiable in the extreme. In a short space of time the incomes of those who have not held office for twenty years will come to an end; and they will be left either to starve on the spot or to depend upon whatever miserable pittance may be collected for them elsewhere. Their churches will be closed. Past experience has shown us how little prospect there is for the development of other religious teaching than that of the Catholic Church in many parts of France; and we anticipate the disappearance of all positive religion from these parishes.

A great deal must depend upon the decision of the Papacy with regard to the constitution of those 'Associations Cultuelles' which will be empowered to take over and administer Church property, and are authorised to distribute their surplus amongst the poorer parishes. There are rumours that the bishops have appealed to the Holy See to accept the law and to work it for the best; but this is not known for certain. The decision of the Supreme Pontiff must be fraught with the most serious consequences. On the one side it is argued that these associations may, in due course, become as wealthy as the Church was under the Concordat; and that the liberty which they enjoy under the law may, if liberally interpreted, give them great power for good. On the other hand, it is contended the Government is not to be trusted; and that the acceptance by the Church of these associations will be used against it. The necessities of the political situation may also force the Radicals to anti-clerical legislation with the object of uniting all sections of the

Left and of distracting public attention from other matters. Then, again, those who do not wish the Pope to recognise the 'Associations Cultuelles' maintain that in their hearts the people are really religious, and that they will never understand to what separation may lead until the churches have been closed, the priests forced to officiate in secret, and religious persecution is in full swing.

Strange to say, it was one of the fairest provisions of the law that first roused popular hostility to its administration. Some members of the Opposition realised the danger of transferring all the property that remained to the Church from the 'Conseils de fabrique' to the 'Associations Cultuelles' without an inventory; and an amendment to this effect was adopted with the consent of all parties. The Socialists wished to see the law administered before the general election. They therefore insisted on the enforcement of this clause before the rules were ready and published. The idea got abroad that this was done to make confiscation easier in the future. There had also been a series of attacks upon religion; and these attacks had left a good deal of bitterness behind them. Moreover, it was the first practical evidence of the existence of the new law; and it provoked an outburst of indignation from one end of France to the other. The peasant might not be a regular church-goer, but his Church had witnessed the most important religious events in his own life and in that of his forbears. It was part of his property, and he resented any interference with it on the part of Government officials. The opportunity was also an admirable one for a political demonstration. The elections were imminent; and it was hoped that the unpopularity of these inventories would react against the Government in the polling-booths. There were demonstrations in the most unexpected quarters. The most irreligious communes were often the most hostile. Matters culminated when, at Boeshoppe, a man was killed; the whole question was brought before the Chamber; and M. Rouvier was compelled to resign.

From this moment the fate of the Conservative party was sealed. M. Dubief, the Minister of the Interior, an honest and conscientious fanatic, made way for M. Clémenceau, one of the ablest and most unscrupulous

members of the 'Bloc.' Had M. Dubief remained in office, the Government would not, in all probability, have interfered very much with the elections. A zealous *préfet* might here and there have exerted himself to the utmost on behalf of the Government, but he would not have been encouraged from above to adopt extreme measures. This was not M. Clémenceau's policy. He was the last resort of the 'Bloc.' It was his duty to win the general election; and he was determined to do so at all costs.

His first step showed great wisdom. The inventories, which had roused so much ill-feeling, were stopped by a circular to the *préfets* wherever they were likely to lead to disturbances. A general uprising of the trade-unions, accompanied by a universal strike, was expected on May 1; and it was anticipated there would be fighting in the streets of Paris. The Opposition press encouraged this idea; and several timid householders fled from Paris across the frontier. There were strikes in the north of France and in the arsenals; houses were burnt; and those workmen who wished to fulfil their contracts were subjected to the most extreme forms of intimidation. The mining districts of the Nord and of the Pas de Calais were in a state of anarchy. M. Clémenceau showed great tact and firmness in the face of all these difficulties. Soldiers were sent to the disaffected districts in large numbers, but with strict injunctions to show themselves as little as possible. Their conduct was admirable, showing the greatest forbearance in the most trying circumstances. Paris was a centre of military activity. Fifty thousand men were quartered in the streets, and its houses were provisioned as if for a siege. One householder introduced trout into his bathroom and another admitted cattle and sheep into his garden to provide against emergencies. Hams and preserved meats were also purchased in large quantities. The first of May came and passed without any appreciable disturbance anywhere. Confidence in the Government and in its power of preserving law and order was established. This was M. Clémenceau's second triumph; and it was all the more complete as the Opposition press had anticipated disaster both in Paris and in the country.

The course was now clear for the general election. The Government had much to fear. The inventories had

been most unpopular; and the Socialists were decidedly discontented. Even the ministerialists expected a loss of some thirty or forty seats. They did not believe in more than that, for the Government holds all the trump cards in its hands. It is the source of all favours and the fountain of honour. A commune wishes for a new road, a railway, a bridge, or a canal. Its prospects are very much enhanced if it has steadily voted in favour of the Government. A hostile commune knows its chances of favourable consideration are very small. Again, there are said to be some 681,000 government officials in France. Each one of these must be a canvasser, or at least vote for the Government of the day. Promotion is usually the reward of the zealous official. There are constant vacancies in these posts, which are filled by the nominations of the local party-hack. The *préfet's* power is, moreover, omnipotent, for he is the channel through which all recommendations reach the Ministry of the Interior. He is represented in the arrondissements by *sous-préfets*, and in the communes by *délégués*, who keep him in touch with all that goes on. The *fiches* had materially increased his power; and the terrorism that runs through the whole government service is a strong factor. Each official knows that everything he says and does—even, as some fear, his most secret thoughts—will in due course reach the ears of the authorities. They therefore must at least appear to be ministerialists.

This feeling necessarily permeates the whole of the civil service, and inspires not only the official, but those who depend upon him, to support the Government. Nor is this all. The right to sell stamps and tobacco is regarded as a great privilege in a small commune, and goes by favour. Moreover, the Frenchman dearly loves a decoration. The Legion of Honour, the *mérite agricole*, and the *palmes académiques*, though originally destined for those who had earned them in their respective spheres, are now too often given as rewards for political work, or withheld from political opponents. It is therefore not astonishing when a Government survives disgrace or disaster; the miracle is when it is turned out of office. Some constituencies are, it is true, still anti-ministerial; but this may generally be assigned to laxity on the part of the local authorities, or to the presence of

a wealthy candidate or resident who can do more for his constituents than the Government can; in some cases, no doubt, it is due to strong political feeling.

On May 6, 1906, the parties met at the polling-booths. On the Opposition side were ranged, first, the 'Action Libérale,' led by M. Jacques Piou and Count Albert de Mun, which includes Royalists and Bonapartists who have remained staunch, or who have, in obedience to the Pope, rallied to the Republic. They represent those Catholics who protest against the whole policy of the 'Bloc,' its treatment of religious orders, and the separation of Church and State. In some cases its representatives did not make much profession of devotion to the Church. For instance, one of the candidates for Carcassonne said: 'They accuse me of being a clerical—me, Pendariés, who never drag my knees over the flags of a church, but protest from the bottom of my heart against delation, sneaks, informers, and Freemasonry.' Next came the Nationalists, the outcome of the Dreyfus agitation, a body of men recruited from all parties, who put national defence in the forefront of their programme, and regard M. Doumer, the former Governor of Indo-China, and M. Gauthier de Clagny as their leaders. Finally, the Progressist-Republicans, men of moderate Whiggish views, the remnant of the old country party, organised by M. Méline, and strongly opposed to anti-clerical legislation. Their most prominent leaders are M. Ribot and M. Renault-Morlière.

On the other side were ranged the Republicans of the Left, a party of eighty-three members founded by those moderate Radicals and Republicans who left the Progressists under M. Waldeck-Rousseau. They cover a wide range, some having followed, before the formation of M. Sarrien's Ministry, M. Poincaré and M. Barthou, who represent the moderate elements in the Cabinet, whilst the more Radical section followed M. Buisson, M. Berthelot, and M. Rabier. Next come the Radicals, ninety in number, who are not easily distinguished from the Radical-Socialists, 119 strong. They have, in fact, since 1901, fused their organisation with that of the 'Radical and Radical-Socialist party,' and adopted a common programme. If a distinction were drawn, we should say that the Radical-Socialist inclines to state-

monopolies more than the Radical; but they are a *bourgeois* party, and will not tolerate state-ownership of the means of production.

The Socialist party were, in 1902, split up into two sections—those who advocated the presence of M. Millerand as the Socialist hostage in M. Waldeck-Rousseau's Ministry, and those who wished to preserve their independence of all *bourgeois* parties. They have been united since April 1904 under the name of 'Socialistes Unifiés.' M. Jaurès has now adopted the collectivist programme in its entirety, and severed his alliance with the Government. The old distinction between 'Blanquiste,' 'Allemaniste,' and 'Guesdiste' has disappeared; and all socialists of these various sections are united under the leadership of M. Jaurès, whose action is however carefully watched by his rival, Jules Guesde, a fanatical and conscientious socialist of the old school, who has returned to the Chamber as deputy for Roubaix. Outside the 'Socialistes Unifiés' are the 'Socialistes Indépendants,' who call themselves by many epithets, such as 'Républicain,' 'Patriote,' 'Anti-Collectiviste,' and belong to the same party, but are scattered over all parts of the Chamber. Some indeed, like M. Millerand, were supported by the Nationalist party, and were therefore regarded as absolutely outside the pale of M. Jaurès' followers.

The result of the general election was a complete triumph, all along the line, for the supporters of the Government. The 'Action Libérale' have suffered less than any other section of the Opposition. They have fallen from 84 to 78, showing a net loss of six seats. The Nationalists, whose *raison d'être* is no longer what it was in 1902, have fallen from 53 to 30; whilst the Progressists have, through their very moderation in a fight between extreme views, fallen from 95 to 66.

On the other hand, the Republicans of the Left have increased their numbers from 83 to 90, while the Radicals have risen from 96 to 115, and the Radical-Socialists from 119 to 132. The 'Socialistes Unifiés,' who at the first ballots only held their own, have now increased from 41 to 54, whilst the 'Socialistes Indépendants,' who were previously only 14, are now 20 strong. It is, then, with the Radicals that the future of the new Parliament lies. With the assistance of the Republican Left they

can form and maintain a Government which shall be absolutely independent of the Socialists on the one side and of the Right upon the other.

This majority cannot be regarded as fully synonymous with popular sentiment. We have already referred to the extent to which an election can be prepared by the Minister of the Interior and the organisation at his command. The peculiar machinery by which the will of the people is ascertained in France also tells in favour of the Government of the day. In the first place, the ballot is not, strictly speaking, secret. The ballot-papers are not ready-made with the candidates' names printed upon them and space left for the necessary cross. The voter either secures a slip of paper on which the candidate's name has been printed, or he writes it himself. This paper can be so marked that the presiding officer can identify it and ascertain who has voted and how he has voted. The votes are counted in each village or ward, and not in the chief town of the constituency. Identification is therefore a comparatively easy task. The stuffing of ballot-boxes is also extremely common, as has been proved, amongst other cases, by the Lodève election petition. Thus, at St Felix-de-Lodez, 151 votes were recorded from a total of 125 names on the register. In another commune 91 voted where there were 80 names on the register. In a third commune 320 voted, and yet there were only 300 names on the register. The validity of an election is determined by the Chamber; and it is therefore not surprising that M. Péliste is declared duly elected for Lodève (Hérault) by a majority of 400 to 69.

Similar scandals have occurred in many other constituencies. Thus, in 1902 there were more votes recorded at Carmaux, in the Tarn, than there were names on the register. Moreover, when the electors arrived, they found that the mayor and his bureau had taken possession of the polling-booth before the legal hour; and it was strongly suspected that the interval had been devoted to stuffing the ballot-boxes. The Marquis de Solages wished to take every precaution on this occasion. His friends therefore determined to watch the proceedings, and arrived on the spot a few minutes before the legal hour, 7 o'clock in the morning. When the mayor arrived, he refused to declare the poll open, and shut himself up in his own house,

though all he was asked to do was to allow two of M. de Solages' supporters to see fair-play. It was only when the troops arrived, and he could clear the polling-booths of all hostile elements, that the polling began. M. de Solages' friends were allowed to be present at first; but, when they tried to find out how many of the voters were on the register, they were summarily expelled by the troops. They were afterwards readmitted, but kept in a corner of the room, and refused leave to take any notes. Although the legal hour for closing the poll was 6 o'clock, it was kept open until 11.40 in the evening. M. de Solages had some fifteen counters ready to see fair-play, but they were refused admission; whilst the whole counting was placed in the hands of some fifty supporters of M. Jaurès, the Socialist candidate.

Such is the story told in the Chamber by Baron Amédée de Reille. It may or may not be true; but the evidence in its support is overwhelming. Baron de Reille did not ask to have M. Jaurès' election invalidated, but only for an enquiry; and this enquiry was refused by an overwhelming majority. In these circumstances it is hardly surprising that a greater number of petitions are not presented. No member of the minority has any prospect of succeeding in an election petition. It is often argued that no member of the 'Bloc' who has secured a smaller majority than five hundred is legally elected. This is possibly a gross exaggeration; but, until the control of the Chamber over election petitions is abolished, and these matters transferred to independent tribunals, we have no opportunity of gauging to what extent the majority really represents the wishes and aspirations of the people.

Other elements have doubtless helped the 'Bloc' to secure their victory. The Catholics are very much divided and split up, some believing in resistance to the utmost, others thinking that the country is sick of the question and ready to submit to the worst for the sake of peace. Again, the Opposition is by no means united on social reform. Some believe they can never rally the democracy to their side until they show their earnestness on their behalf, whilst others are afraid to deal with such dangerous questions. It is not easy to know what France really wants. The situation is most complicated, and is beyond

the comprehension of most Frenchmen. Thus, the inventories had aroused the most violent opposition in many parts of France where the electors have always supported anti-Catholic deputies. Peasants who usually voted for the Radical candidate came out in their hundreds to protest against any attack upon their Church. In one village no less than eighty-eight made their wills before resisting the authorities; and yet, when the general election came, the Catholic candidate hardly received any support in that very village.

This want of logic and consistency has been explained by ignorance and by Ministerial pressure. These two factors may have great weight, but they are certainly inadequate to account for the overwhelming victory of the Government. The peasant has remained a Catholic by tradition and by sentiment. He may even believe in his inherited faith; but he sees no connexion between his religious convictions and his vote. In one village of Savoy the mayor sings every Sunday in the choir and goes regularly to the Sacraments, but he always votes openly, as a delegate, for the Radical senator. Why this inconsistency? There is no denying it—the peasant distrusts the Catholic candidate, be he Royalist or Republican. In the first place, he can do nothing for him; he can neither secure for the district the railway or the road it wants, nor obtain for the voter's son the place of road-mender or postman he desires. Besides, the Catholic candidate is usually supported by the *château*; and the peasant believes his interest is antagonistic to that of the *château*. As a Burgundian peasant said recently to an eminent political economist who had property in his parish: 'Listen to me, monsieur, and I will speak frankly to you. We like you, and my father was your father's tenant. If you really want our help, you have only to call upon us, and it is yours. But do not ask me to vote for your candidate. What do you expect? We belong to the people, and must support the candidate the people want—the man who will pass laws in our favour.' It is for this reason that some French Catholics are strongly in favour of their party adopting social reform as part of their programme.

In fine, we may sum up the situation by saying that, beneath all the apparent indifference, there are far more Catholics in France than people think. If ever

persecution were to become acute, if the churches were to be closed, this would become clear to the world; but, until this extreme is reached, the voters will not give their support to a man who does not thoroughly understand their wants and requirements. M. Sabatier, who relies on reform from within the Church, may perhaps expect too much when he looks forward to a new Catholicism,

'in which earnestness, hard work, manliness, love will be the supreme virtues, a Catholicism which will resemble the old no more than the butterfly resembles the chrysalis; and yet it will be the old, and will be able to-morrow to emblazon on the pediments of its temples the words of the Galilean, "Non veni solvere sed adimplere" ("I have not come to destroy, but to fulfil").'

But those who know France well, who have mixed with the people of all classes and of all parties, are by no means despondent of the future. They know how uncertain it is, how it is always the unexpected that happens in France. The children of the Revolution produced the great Catholic movement of the thirties and forties; and their children again, educated under the 'loi Falloux' in Congregational schools, are the authors of all this anti-clerical legislation. The future is therefore uncertain, full of possibilities for good and for evil; but underneath it all there is that toiling, laborious France which works quietly and unostentatiously. It is in this France that all hope for the future must lie. The unexpected may therefore be awaited with some measure of confidence; and it will probably come when the casual observer has given up all hope of its realisation.

Art. XIII.—THE GOVERNMENT, THE SESSION, AND THE EDUCATION BILL.

WHEN the process of selecting crews for the University boat-race is in its embryonic stage, it is no unusual thing to hear cautious critics say that this crew or that is made up of men who are individually excellent oarsmen, but that it is impossible to judge whether the collective crew will be good, bad, or indifferent until it has been rowing together for some time. And the result more often than not justifies the prudence of the reservation. The same cautious criticism applies also to Governments. No task perhaps that falls to the lot of a statesman is more difficult or delicate than the formation of a Ministry. Other considerations than personal merit and aptitude have to guide his choice. He has to conciliate interests, and allot to the various sections upon which he relies for his majority what is called a fair share of official appointments. In this respect the Prime Minister is at a disadvantage as compared with the presidents of the Oxford and Cambridge Boat Clubs. They, it is true, may err in judgment, and sometimes perhaps be influenced by favouritism, but at least the preponderating motive must be to get together the very best available crew.

Probably no Prime Minister has had greater difficulties in making up his Ministry than had Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman in December last. There were, to recur to our analogy, no lack of excellent oarsmen, and it may fairly be said that the *personnel* of the present administration is above average merit; but the crucial question arose: Would these capable oarsmen pull together when it came to racing? It is not imputing disloyalty or selfishness or obstinacy to any members of the Cabinet to say that they could not pull together, and that, in the circumstances in which they were selected, it was impossible that they should. Out of a fairly united party it is no intolerable business to construct a fairly united Cabinet; but, when the actual or anticipated majority is composed of numerous sections not agreed on more than a few points, then a harmonious Cabinet is out of the question. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's party was made up of 'items,' of whom it is true to say that there

were only two great questions upon which they were thoroughly at one. In the first place, they desired, and from their point of view rightly, the ejection from office of the late Unionist Government. Secondly, they were determined to adhere to the principles of Cobdenism in their entirety. But even here we are called upon to make a qualification. There is no evidence to prove that the Irish Nationalist party and its supporters in the constituencies have ever concerned themselves much about the theories and practice of Free Trade. Indeed there are not wanting signs that a majority of these gentlemen would, if dealing with this problem solely on its merits and not as affecting the fortunes of parties, be rank Protectionists.

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman must be credited with the intelligence that anticipates events before they occur, for the Government he formed on the eve of the dissolution was approximately representative of the different sections of those returned as his supporters. But, while there was great electioneering advantage in limiting the issues to two very simple points, it was and is a misfortune for the Government that both those points were negative. The late Administration had already left office before the elections; and so, when Parliament met, the former of the points had disappeared. With regard to the other, the return of an overwhelming majority pledged to Free Trade converted the defence of Cobdenism into the easiest of sinecures. Incidentally it may be pointed out that the result really destroys the absurd but much advertised fallacy of mandates. If a Government is morally and politically incapacitated from legislating when it has exhausted its mandates, then Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's Government had practically run to the end of their tether almost as soon as they took their seats in Parliament.

That is the *reductio ad absurdum* of a theory which so unimpeachable a Radical and so well informed an historian as Mr Herbert Paul has rightly called ridiculous, unconstitutional, and undemocratic. That there were so-called mandates of diverse nature given to the component sections of the majority is beyond doubt. But they were not given unanimously by the electors who returned the majority; and consequently the Cabinet as

a whole has never been unanimous on these secondary issues. The net result of all these considerations is that, good as are the oarsmen, they do not pull together; the boat naturally rolls a good deal, and much of the individual strength and skill of the crew is wasted. But, before beginning the task of criticism, it is a matter of great satisfaction to note one exception to this rule.

In the first place the whole country feels that the conduct of its foreign relations is in hands as thoroughly to be trusted as were those of Sir Edward Grey's immediate predecessors. It is part of the large debt of gratitude we owe to the late Lord Salisbury that, from the time when he returned to the Foreign Office in 1886, with an ample majority at his back, he set himself to work to mark out a chart, not only for his own guidance, but for that of his successors, on such a comprehensive scale that no one would be tempted to neglect it or to shape his course without reference to it. It was, if we may say so, the Magna Carta of latter-day foreign policy. Lord Rosebery and Lord Kimberley, to their lasting credit, followed the directions bequeathed to them. Sir Edward Grey, with the unanimous approval of all schools of political thought, is adhering to the precedents set by his two immediate Whig predecessors, and with the most satisfactory results. When we remember how large the controversy on foreign affairs loomed for more than three decades before 1886, we have indeed much to be thankful for.

It would have been a cause for most profound self-congratulation if this unqualified praise of the Foreign Office could also be conceded to what is really a sister office, that of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. We shall not enter into details as to the filling and backing, the precipitation and sudden arrests, which have characterised the conduct of the Colonial Office under the control of Lord Elgin and of Mr Winston Churchill. We abstain from close examination, principally because experience seems to be teaching the Department the beginning of wisdom. And no man who puts patriotism above party will utter a word of unnecessary recrimination which might possibly drive the Administration back into the paths we all hope they have abandoned. We cite the recurrent changes of tone and even of policy with

regard to South Africa only as an illustration of the divisions in the majority amply reflected in the divisions in the Cabinet. One day a Minister would inflict a wound; the next day another member of the Government would assuage the pain with soothing and honeyed words. The troubles of the Government in Imperial matters are traceable not to inconsistency, which is generally a venial vice, but to lack of cohesion amongst themselves. How can it be otherwise? In the Cabinet, as in the majority, there are staunch Imperialists, who would appeal to the country to make great sacrifices for the defence and development of the British Empire. There are others who, with Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, rather dislike the word Imperialism. There is yet another section which openly maintains that the money spent upon Imperial defences is wasted and should be given to the poor; and one result is that Mr Haldane, who, in more senses than one, is the most promising statesman who has presided in Pall Mall for many years, is beset upon two sides to reduce expenditure upon the army.

The same cause is responsible for the same effects in every measure of primary or secondary importance introduced into the House by the present Government. Nothing could be more startling than what occurred in connexion with the rival Bills dealing with labour disputes. There are many Liberals in the House and in the Government who are or have been manufacturers and merchants and large employers of labour; to them the claim put forward by trade-unions to be 'exempt from the law' was naturally repugnant, and their opinions were shared by most if not all the lawyers in the Ministry. The Government Bill bore upon the face of it the unmistakable stamp of compromise. It was introduced in an able and moderate speech by the Attorney-General. The compromise, if not agreeable to the capitalist, was absolutely hateful to the Labour members and extreme Radicals in the House of Commons. Member after member rose from below the gangway on both sides of the House to declare that they would not accept the Government Bill as it stood. On the second night of the debate, to the astonishment of many of his colleagues, and to the consternation of the House as a whole, the Prime Minister threw over his own chief law-officer, and declared that he agreed in principle

with the arguments of the Labour party. The timely indisposition of the Attorney-General enabled Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman to place the conduct of the Bill in the hands of the more expansive Solicitor-General, whose gratuitously offensive rhetoric is doing the Government no good. The Royal Commission appointed by Mr Balfour to consider the problem raised by the Taff Vale judgment, which is the crux of the whole question, had strongly and almost unanimously protested against the claim of the employés that their funds should not be liable for damage done by the action of trade-unions. The Government Bill, while it conceded many of the demands made by the Labour party, still proposed to grant immunity only where the actionable damage was unauthorised by the committee or some person acting on their authority. In the Labour party's Bill, clause 3, with a frankness amounting to cynicism, seeks to enact that 'an action shall not be brought against a trade-union or other association aforesaid for the recovery of damage sustained by any person or persons by reason of the action of a member or members of such trade-union or other association aforesaid.' As the Attorney-General pointed out in his opening speech, such a clause would permit committees of trade-unions or groups of trade-union members to sanction with impunity even criminal means in furtherance of a strike. If the Labour party have their way, the only remedy left to the employers is to prosecute the person or persons guilty of the act—if they can lay hands upon them—or to sue them civilly for damages, which, of course, would be futile. The hoarded funds of the trade-unions, whose members brought about so ruinous a catastrophe, would be altogether exempt, even though it could be shown that the contemplated act had been known to the members of the committee. How these conflicting principles are to be remedied remains yet to be seen. Once more we have a forcible illustration of the difficulty of keeping straight a boat in which various members of the crew are striking the water at different times.

Much the same tendency is noticeable in the Bill for extending existing Acts providing compensation for accidents. In principle this measure is non-contentious, though several of the clauses are highly controversial.

It was read a second time without division, and referred to a Grand Committee. Again and again the Government members of the Committee were beaten by their own nominal supporters. Clauses were introduced or amendments proposed so adverse to the capitalist that even Mr Gladstone, who, as Home Secretary, had charge of the Bill, was obliged to resist; and on more than one occasion he hinted at the possibility of the abandonment of the measure. It is unnecessary to discuss in detail the amendments forced into the Bill by the Labour party and their sympathisers; it is sufficient to say that one of them at least would ruin many a small tradesman in every part of the United Kingdom. In order to maintain even the semblance of rhythm in 'the racing oars,' we suppose that there will be further concessions and further compromises. To the same category belongs a measure dealing with Land Tenure introduced by a private member, subsequently unseated after petition. It is not a good Bill, but it has enjoyed the patronage of those Ministers whom a complacent Premier allows to 'go as they please.' Its object is simply to introduce into England the thin end of the wedge of the system which has not been a conspicuous success in Ireland. There is no demand amongst tenant-farmers for such a so-called reform; and it is notorious that the conditions of British farming are so utterly different from those of Ireland that the provisions of this Bill would prove equally injurious to landlord and tenant.

In regard to the Education Bill, the same causes have produced and are producing the same effects; and the whole measure bears an impress of the divisions in the Cabinet and in the majority of the House of Commons. The elections of January were won largely by the consolidation of the whole Nonconformist vote. It was incumbent therefore upon Ministers, who indeed were deeply pledged, to make some attempt to reward the resolute cooperation of their dissenting supporters. On the other hand, the Irish Catholic vote in England was cast solidly in favour of Radical candidates who expressed more or less nebulous sympathy with the cause of Home Rule. But the Irish Catholics in England, supported by their more powerful allies in Ireland, and acting under

the imperative advice of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, are bitterly opposed to the destruction of denominational education; and, while the mass of Labour members, not, we believe, in this particular case representing Labour opinion, demanded purely secular teaching, there was also a considerable number of Liberal churchmen who declined to be parties to what, as we pointed out last April, is a flank attack upon the Church of England. So great was the confusion caused by these cross-currents in the party and in the Cabinet that we understand that the final settlement of the Bill was not effected until noon of the day on which it was introduced.

The course of the discussion of the Bill in the House of Commons has in the main followed the lines which appeared probable in view of the circumstances attending its introduction. More than once Mr Birrell has been unable to resist the contention of the Opposition, reinforced by independent Liberal members, that the Bill as drawn would permit the infliction, on those who have hitherto provided or enjoyed definite religious teaching, of gross injustice, going far beyond what his own declarations had led the House to suppose to be contemplated. Thereupon he has offered 'concessions' which, if they had stood alone, might have been reasonably regarded as in some degree mitigating the harsh possibilities of the measure, but has accompanied them by qualifying provisions which counterbalance, or more than counterbalance, the value of the suggested modification.

Thus it was pointed out that, under the combined operation of clauses 1 and 2, if a local education authority were to refuse to take over existing voluntary schools, extensive areas might exist in which there would not even be available the meagre 'ordinary facilities for special religious instruction' contemplated under clause 3 as attachable to the transfer of a voluntary school. This contention was reinforced by the public declarations of persons connected with one or more considerable local education authorities, that, for their part, they would be altogether against taking over any voluntary school. In these circumstances Mr Birrell admitted that there was a 'gap' between clauses 2 and 3 which needed to be filled up, and intimated that a new clause would, or might be, introduced later for that purpose. The new clause

would give the Board of Education power to require a local authority not to refuse, without good reason, to take over any voluntary school within its area. So far, well. But this compulsion, Mr Birrell said, must be bilateral; if the owners of a voluntary school refused to transfer their school without good cause, the Board of Education must be empowered to require their consent. It is obvious that the owners might, and in a great number of cases probably would, consider that a transfer of these buildings, erected and dedicated for the education of children in the principles of the Church of England, to undenominational uses, would be little, if at all, better than sacrilege. But the Board of Education must be able to override any such scruples, or else all local education authorities must be left entirely free to dispense with all the voluntary schools in their respective areas.

A similar example of the fashion in which the Government affect to provide evenhanded justice occurred in connexion with clause 4. The question at issue was that of the duty of the local education authority in regard to the granting of the 'extended facilities' for special religious instruction contemplated by that clause as equitable in certain circumstances in populous urban districts. Was this duty to be made obligatory? Mr Evelyn Cecil proposed that it should be made so by the substitution of the word 'shall' for 'may.' But that was a course far too clear and direct to suit the Government. Mr Birrell brought forward an elaborate series of amendments, one effect of which was to empower the Board of Education, when the conditions specified in the clause were satisfied, to require the local authority to grant the 'extended facilities'—in other words, to allow the denominational character of the teaching in the schools in question to continue. So far, good. But, coupled with this 'concession,' were other provisions constituting a double set-off. On the one hand, it was prescribed that, in the case of a school in which 'extended facilities' were granted, the local education authority should obtain the use of the school-house rent free, though no assurance was given that, when new teachers were appointed, they should belong to the denomination concerned. On the other hand, it was laid down that, if, in the opinion of the Board of Education, special circumstances existed making such a

course desirable, they might, instead of requiring the local education authority to grant the 'extended facilities,' issue an order constituting the school a 'State-aided' school, in which the denominational education would indeed be allowed to go on without interference, but which would receive no aid from the rates. Practically, as was pointed out, this means that if the Board of Education, in the case of any particular school, should shrink from coming into collision with the local education authority concerned, they might issue an order for the school to starve.

These instances are enough to exhibit the slavery, partly willing and partly unwilling, under which the Government lie to the political Nonconformist section of their supporters. That bondage is the main controlling influence upon their educational legislation. The only circumstance qualifying it is the desire to avoid alienating the Irish Nationalist party and the Roman Catholic vote in this country, which was largely secured for the Radicals at the General Election by promises that the denominational character of the Roman Catholic schools should not suffer. It is evident, from the speeches of Lord Edmund Talbot, Mr Dillon, and others, that these promises are now regarded as having been scandalously broken, and that no amendments so far introduced into the Education Bill are held to have repaired the breach.

From time to time Ministers refer to the principles underlying their Education Bill; but there are none. As was pointed out in the last issue of this Review, the professed desire for the establishment of a uniform type of school under a uniform type of control had been abandoned in the Bill as introduced. The Bill provided for at least three types of school; and now, under Mr Birrell's complex amendments to clause 4, of which many were carried, without discussion, under the operation of the closure-by-compartment arrangement, a fourth entirely distinct type—the State-aided, but not rate-aided school—is prominently provided for. The whole justification for this proposal is that, by the sacrifice of rate-aid, the owners of voluntary schools might be willing to redeem themselves from the control of the local authorities by a great price to obtain freedom. We should be far indeed from cavilling at any educational system because it provided

for variety rather than uniformity of type. But what is to be said for a general disturbance in the name of uniformity, carried out at heavy cost in money and far heavier cost in religious and social embitterment, which nevertheless results in enhanced diversity?

What, again, is to be said for a revolution in some of the essential conditions of life in rural England, carried through on the cry of 'Abolition of tests for teachers,' which, as was made clear from ministerial statements in clause 7, will simply result in the general establishment of the test involved in an enquiry as to the teacher's willingness or capacity to teach undenominational religion?

It is absolutely impossible that the patchwork scheme embodied in the Government Bill, as it now stands, can provide a settlement with any hope of permanence. The agitation which has been in progress ever since the provisions of the Bill were set forth has shown that it rouses feelings of indignation and alarm among members of very diverse schools of thought. Those who know the nature and course of that agitation are agreed in holding that, in the intensity of the emotion exhibited, and the magnitude of the numbers roused, there has been nothing more remarkable within living memory. The things which so profoundly stir the popular mind are the perversion of sacred trusts and the threatened denial of all assurance to the parent that his child will have any opportunity of being brought up in his own faith. These feelings have been manifested in every part of the country, urban and rural, industrial, commercial, agricultural, and seafaring, on an unprecedented scale and in an unmistakable manner.

Thus the House of Lords, when the Bill is sent up to them, will have been provided with every possible evidence known to the Constitution that the allegation of a mandate for any such measure is altogether contrary to the facts. It was not understood that the Church schools were to be abolished and their trust-deeds torn up, either in town or country. It was not understood that the teaching of an undenominational form of religion at the public expense would be established. Still less, if possible, was it imagined that, if the Liberal party were returned to power, a cruel and arbitrary disability would be imposed upon many of the most competent members of a

very important profession. It will be for the House of Lords to take the necessary measures to secure that the unconstitutional pretext of an electoral mandate shall not be used to pass an Act of wholesale oppression.

As to the precise steps which the Peers may take to prevent so great a wrong, this is not the time to speak dogmatically. But we believe that it will be found that the interests of religious freedom and equality, and those of common justice, are safe in their hands, which have been strengthened both by the massive movement of protest in the country, and by the marked falling-off on important issues—such as that of the mandatory character of clause 4—of the strength of the ministerial majority in the House of Commons. Nevertheless it is important to bear in mind that our whole educational system is in a condition of altogether unstable equilibrium, and that strenuous efforts will be required to bring it as soon as may be on to a firm and lasting basis.

There are many thoughtful persons who hold that, with that view, and also with the object of strengthening and giving coherence to the opposition to the Bill in both Houses and in the country, a constructive policy should very soon, at least in outline, be put forward by the friends of the Church. There would be no use in any such attempt if no approach to unity had already been indicated among churchmen; but happily that is not the case. The main essentials of a just and lasting settlement have already attracted a very large amount of agreement among churchmen. The debates on the first clause of the Education Bill, and especially on Sir William Anson's amendment, brought out a substantial accord, in a striking fashion, among the opponents of that measure in the House of Commons, in favour of a settlement consisting of an adoption and adaptation to English needs of the German system. No such accord was obtainable with reference to the scheme which has been especially associated with the name of Mr Chamberlain. Its theoretical justice indeed, as among different religious bodies, is not denied; but it is recognised that if the State simply stands aside in the matter of religious education, while allowing facilities, however extensive, for the giving of religious teaching, there can be no guarantee that universally or even generally effective use will be

made of those facilities. That use would vary in completeness and effectiveness with the zeal, the wealth, the energy, and the organising faculty of the religious bodies as represented in different parts of the country. There could, in a word, be no security under it that many children would not grow up in paganism.

Mr Chamberlain's scheme, in fact, notwithstanding its abstract justice, and while infinitely preferable to the policy of pure secularism which the House of Commons has emphatically condemned, is yet at variance with the fundamental principles on which the educational policy of a Christian State ought to be framed; for it fails to make secure provision for definite religious teaching as an integral part of our system of education. The sound policy may be expressed thus. The English State rejects secularism in its school education, and considers that religion is an essential feature of any sound system of education. But, alike on grounds of justice as among the various religious bodies, and in view of its own incompetence, even if justice allowed it to make selection among them, it refuses to make such selection, and invites, through the local education authorities, the co-operation of the religious bodies in obtaining teachers whom they can trust as competent to take part in the work of educating the children of their respective members. In order that such co-operation may be as effective as possible, the teachers so appointed by the local education authority must be employed, as far as is reasonably practicable, on the staff of the schools. This is the German plan. In Germany, if there are enough Jewish, Protestant, and Roman Catholic children in a district to fill, or nearly fill, three schools, a school for each denomination is erected; but, if there are not enough children to fill three, or it may be two, schools of adequate size, one school receives children of two faiths; the headmaster being chosen from among members of the Church to which the majority of the parents belong, and the second teacher from members of the other Church.

There is no reason why a plan of this nature should not be adopted in England. Its operation would probably be that many schools in towns would remain, as is contemplated, but not at all secured, in clause 4 of the Government Education Bill, practically denominational,

though under the local education authority. But in all schools attended by children of different faiths the teachers would be, so far as possible, appointed in such a manner as to be representative of those faiths, and to give instruction to the children of the parents respectively attached to them. In the case of Nonconformists, who have combined to produce the Free Church catechism, and who, to a large extent, now practise intercommunion, it would be in almost all cases satisfactory to their feeling that a teacher able and willing to give instruction based on the Free Church catechism should be appointed. But, if there were a certain number of parents who desired instruction for their children in accordance with some other syllabus, it ought to be provided. It is contemplated that access should be enjoyed by the clergy and ministers of other denominations on suitable occasions to the children of their respective flocks in the schools, to test the character of the teaching given, and possibly to take part in giving it.

Under the scheme above outlined the salaries of the teachers employed by the local authority, after consultation with recognised representatives of the religious bodies concerned, would be charged to the public account; for the teachers would be employed in discharging a vital public service—that of bringing up the children in the faith of their parents. Their qualifications for the work of secular instruction would continue to be ascertained in the usual fashion.

Of course this system would not, in the cant phrase, abolish tests for teachers. On the contrary, it would be based on the rational principle that assurance must be obtained of the qualifications of teachers to do the most vital part of the work. There is good reason to believe, having regard to the intense interest shown by the parents of Church school-children all over the country, and by many Nonconformists also, in the maintenance of the existing provision for definite religious instruction, that there will be a great ultimate preponderance of feeling in favour of the view that the question of religious education in elementary schools must be determined with reference to the rights of parents and the interests of children, and not with a view to making the profession of teacher universally accessible.

The fact that a system based on these principles is successfully in operation in the country to which, above all others, we habitually defer on educational questions, and that a system based on similar principles has long been satisfactorily working in our industrial schools, would sufficiently refute the allegation, if it should be made, that churchmen are setting up an impracticable ideal. Meanwhile the great object to be sought is that no legislation shall be placed on the statute-book which will inflict injustice on any Church, or disabilities on any parents or any teachers, or will in any manner bar the way to the ultimate establishment of denominational freedom under public control.

The symptoms of ministerial disunion referred to above are disquieting in themselves; but the political disease of which they are the product threatens even more serious consequences. The House of Lords is in a very difficult position when the majority of its members are confronted by an overwhelming majority of opponents in the Lower House. It has always been a matter of astonishment to men of sense that so distinguished a politician as the present Chancellor of the Exchequer should allow himself to indulge in catchpenny phrases about the House of Lords being a mere adjunct of the Carlton Club, and as being inert when Toryism is in the ascendant and active when it is in a hopeless minority in the Lower House. Of course the rank and file of the Radical party utter this kind of nonsense upon platforms to audiences only less ignorant or careless than themselves; but the country naturally expects better things from the intellectual leaders. Second Chambers have always been designed to check extravagant measures, and to give the electors ample time for thinking twice before they commit themselves to irrevocable changes. It is therefore in the nature of things that Second Chambers should be in their essence Conservative, and for two reasons. In the first place, Radicalism admittedly implies a more or less destructive policy—we use the adjective in no offensive sense. The very principle of its existence is to make changes, and even violent changes, for what it thinks to be the public good. And whatever else may be said about a destructive policy, this, at least, will hardly be denied, that, if carried

out, it is irrevocable. If Conservative Administrations pursue the policy of reaction and resistance, the next Radical House of Commons can reverse their action. On the other hand, if the Radicals destroy a Church, confiscate property, or ruin any particular form of business, the mischief can never be undone. In the second place, it is obvious that the Conservative instincts of the majority of the House of Lords must be generally in sympathy with those of a Conservative Administration pursuing a line of slow, evolutionary progress. Some time before the introduction of the first Home Rule Bill, Mr John Bright was a guest at a dinner-party composed almost exclusively of advanced Radicals. Incidentally some one attacked the late Lord Salisbury, for whom, as is well-known, Bright entertained the most profound respect and admiration. After rebuking the assailant, he went on to say: 'To-day there is really no great difference between an intelligent Tory and an intelligent Liberal. The question is only one of driving ten miles an hour or eight; and upon my word,' he added, with emphasis, 'there is a great deal to be said in favour of eight.'

When thoughtless persons make it a ground of accusation against the Upper House that it acts as a drag on the wheels of the chariot of Radical progress, the only reasonable reply is that this is the very function which all Second Chambers exist to fulfil. Nobody but an imbecile would dream of applying the brake to a coach while it is travelling steadily along the level, or when it is climbing a hill. It only comes into operation when the chariot is rushing down steep places at an excessive rate of speed. As we have said, in normal times and in normal circumstances the position of the House of Lords under conditions such as now prevail is difficult and delicate. When, however, the Government of the day adopts what has been called the 'cabman's policy' of 'leaving the fare to you, sir,' the moment it flounders into trouble, an additional and unfair responsibility is imposed on the shoulders of the Peers. Every one of us must have some Radical acquaintance or other who, shaking his head over the more revolutionary proposals of his leaders, or of the extremists who force the hand of their Government, consoles himself with saying that 'the House of Lords will set that right.' This is grossly unjust to the Upper

House; and the injustice is intensified when, as has been so often the case during the last few months, the Government, divided and perplexed, leaves, as we have said, most important issues as open questions to be decided by the majority of the House of Commons. Party ties, especially in a new Parliament, are very strong; and, even when matters are left open, individual members do not like to vote against proposals which are supported by the majority of their leaders. Many a member walks into what he considers the wrong lobby, because he feels sure that the House of Lords will do all that is necessary.

It may be that the next election, or the election after that, will turn upon the relations between the two Houses. There will be scores of members who, having prayed secretly that the Lords will reverse some policy accepted by the Commons, but of which these members heartily disapprove, will go to their constituencies and use this very action of the Peers as an argument for curtailing the powers of, or abolishing, the Second Chamber. And, though the growing habit of imputing unworthy motives to your opponents is to be reprehended, it is impossible to ignore the accumulating mass of evidence which seems to show anxiety on the part of the Ministry to pick a quarrel with the House of Lords. Take what is, after all, a comparatively minor issue, the Bill for the abolition of plural voting. We will not here discuss its merits or demerits. The Prime Minister and all his colleagues are perfectly aware that the Upper House has always insisted that any change in the franchise should be accompanied with a scheme for the redistribution of seats. We learn from Lord Fitzmaurice's 'Life of Lord Granville' that the present Duke of Devonshire, then Lord Hartington, the mainstay of the Cabinet of 1880-85, most strongly urged the justice of this proposition upon Mr Gladstone. It is therefore very likely that the House of Lords will follow historical precedent with regard to this particular Bill.

It must further be remarked that there was no pressing reason why such a measure should be submitted to Parliament in its first session, and to a Parliament in which, in spite of the plural voter, the Liberals are in a majority of three to one. For our own part we do not believe that the plural voter is so determining a factor in elections as he is generally represented to be. It is a

rather curious comment upon the opinions entertained by Radicals of their own policy that they should take it for granted that every man who possesses property in more than one part of the country should of necessity be a Conservative. As a matter of fact, it is doubtful whether there is anything like a large majority of Conservatives over Radicals amongst the out-voters. The creation of faggot-votes has been stopped; but it is well to remember that the first public man who raised the principle and practice of creating faggots to the dignity of a fine art, was no less a person than Richard Cobden. Even assuming that all plural voters are Conservatives or Unionists, their partial disfranchisement cannot materially affect the proportion of the parties in the present House of Commons. So large is the majority at the command of the Prime Minister that he can afford to lose every bye-election occurring during the normal life of Parliament, without seriously diminishing that majority.

The question therefore might well have been left in abeyance till a more convenient season, especially when the time at the disposal of the Government was, through circumstances for which they are not to blame, so unusually limited. It seems, then, as if the Prime Minister and his colleagues were bent upon coming to loggerheads with the House of Lords at the first available opportunity. If we look at the amazing acrobatic feats performed by the Government with regard to the Trade Disputes Bill, to which we have already referred, it is difficult to blind oneself to the inference that Ministers saw their way to putting the House of Lords in a predicament. Their Bill was, presumably, the result of careful deliberations in the Cabinet before it was submitted in its original form to the House of Commons. Let us suppose that the House of Lords simply contents itself with restoring the Bill to the form it bore when it was presented by its authors, and before the Labour party had driven the Prime Minister into the repudiation of his chief legal adviser. One of two things would happen: either the Government would induce a majority to accept the amendment of the House of Lords in order to secure the other advantages which the Bill confers upon employés, while hinting to the Labour party to stir the country with the cry that the House of Lords 'is the

enemy'; or, on the other hand, they might, illogically, inconsistently, and immorally, make this issue the ground of an open declaration of war against the Peers. Yet how, in the name of common-sense, can they properly blame the House of Lords for setting the seal of their approval on what is really a Government measure?

It would be no difficult task to multiply instances in support of the theory that there is on foot an intrigue, not to say a conspiracy, to sap and undermine the House of Lords, just as the Education Bill is flagrantly an attempt to weaken the Church of England. It would be as inexpedient as unbecoming to dictate to the Peers what particular line they should take in dealing with the various Bills submitted to their judgment, though it may be taken for granted that they will at least give Mr Birrell's measure a second reading. But it is an even greater offence against constitutional usage to attempt to menace and bully one branch of the Legislature before it is known what course they intend to pursue. We learn, in the 'Life of Lord Granville,' that when John Bright was in his first Cabinet, and was still a hot-headed, passionate demagogue—if one may use the phrase without offence—he wrote a letter to his constituents fiercely denouncing the Upper Chamber. And from the same source we gather that Mr Gladstone and Lord Granville, the respective leaders of the two Houses, though questioning the construction put upon Mr Bright's words, laid it down as an indisputable constitutional dogma, that it was in the highest degree improper to attempt to limit the freedom and independence of the Upper House. Times have changed; and Mr Lloyd-George, President of the Board of Trade, is permitted without objection or rebuke to repudiate the principle so forcibly insisted upon by Radical leaders of an earlier day, and even to declare that the House of Lords must be 'scrapped' out of the Legislative machinery.

This, of course, is neither the time nor the place to discuss the *rationale* or the authority of what Radicals love to call the 'Gilded Chamber.' But it will be admitted by educated and intelligent men of every shade of political opinion, that, if it be desirable to reform the House of Lords, or for that House to reform itself, the business must be done in an honest, straightforward, and open

way, and not by deliberate and discreditable manœuvres to provoke the Lords into a quarrel with the House of Commons. The evils consequent upon the present abnormal state of public affairs, as we have endeavoured to point out above, are grave. Unfortunately it is a far more easy task to call attention to them than to find, or even to suggest, a remedy. The very foundation of Parliament, as it at present exists, is the two-party system. That system, though it had its faults, was elastic enough to meet the demands of many generations of Englishmen, and strong enough to support the burdens of a constantly growing Empire. That system is disappearing, if it has not already disappeared. Groups have threatened to become as numerous, as antagonistic to one another, and as well organised, as in Germany or in France. It may be well to recall a dictum of the late Lord Salisbury's on this point. He quoted Bismarck's frequent failure, in spite of his enormous advantages, to control the groups in the Prussian or the German Imperial Parliament. He further stated that, though possible, it was extremely difficult to carry on a Government under the group system, even in countries which practically possessed no territory outside their political geographical area. And he concluded, with much emphasis: 'I believe it would be an absolute impossibility to administer the British Empire if the group system ever took root in this country.'

It is to be feared that the motley composition of the Cabinet, and of the majority on which it rests, has not been without its effect on the counsels of the Secretary for War. Mr Haldane's recent speech discloses, or rather shadows forth, a scheme far too large and complicated to be fully discussed in the time and space left at our disposal. But it is clear that it suffers from a duality of aim—the desire for efficiency and the necessity for a large diminution of expense. The former is the natural wish of a competent and conscientious War Minister; the latter is forced upon him by the clamorous demands of a large proportion of his followers. Mr Haldane contemplates a considerable reduction in the regular infantry, and—what is more important and, it must be added, far more dangerous—a still larger proportionate reduction in the artillery. This is surely not the time, with a movement of religious fanaticism spreading in Egypt, a native

revolt, of which no one sees the end, in Natal, the new colonies in an unsettled condition, and growing hostility to the British Government in India, to talk of reductions in our military forces, especially in that arm which cannot be improvised. There was much force in Mr Balfour's criticism that such a change is beginning at the wrong end. It is surely unsafe to make any serious reduction in the Regulars until a complete and efficient scheme has been set on foot for utilising the auxiliaries, and for expanding and supplementing our field-force in time of war. And where is the certainty, or even the probability, that we shall have, under Mr Haldane's plan, an adequate reserve, especially of officers, to supply the losses of war? Mr Haldane is prone to large ideas and magniloquent phrases, but he 'gave away the show' by asserting that, in the general desire for a reduction of armaments, this country was to give the lead. We can imagine the mirth with which such an assumption will be greeted on the Continent; as if we, forsooth, with the smallest and least efficient army possessed by any great Power, were to 'lead' the military states of Europe in the race for economy. What becomes of his nebulous scheme for expansion, of his fine phrases about the Militia and the Volunteers, if it is confessed that there *is* to be a net reduction of the national force after all? This is the upshot; the army must be reduced; and that before there is anything, or the certain prospect of anything, to take the place of the forces to be disbanded. And this is to be done at the bidding of 'groups,' whose members have constantly shown their ignorance of foreign and colonial affairs, and their disregard for the dangers and responsibilities of Empire.

The genius of our race invariably finds, by the most illogical and theoretically absurd devices, a way to solve problems apparently insoluble. That our good fortune will not desert us now is the expectation of every student of our history, and the hope of every patriotic Briton; but that the situation is very formidable, and that it demands the most painstaking consideration from all men of 'light and learning,' is a proposition which few will dare to deny.
